Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-143
Wednesday
25 July 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-143 *25 July 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Canadian Minister Clark's 'New Thinking' Lauded *[TASS]* 1
Clark Backs Economic Dialogue *[TASS]* 1
First Meeting of CSCE Scheduled in New York *[TASS]* 2
TASS Covers Gremitskikh 24 Jul Briefing 2
Iraq-Kuwait Tension 2
OPEC Ruling on Oil Prices 2
Gorbachev-Andreotti Talks 2
Indian Prime Minister's Visit 3
Summary of News Conference 3
Myakotnykh Lauds Results of Cambodian Meeting *[TASS]* 4
Ministry Official on 1945-50 German Camps *[TASS]* 4
Gorbachev Sends Message to World Scout Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 4
Leaders, Politicians Congratulate Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 4
Western Views on German Unification Assessed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jul]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Senate Panel Approves Aid to East Europe *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 7
U.S. Vietnam Veterans Group Meets Ryzhkov *[Moscow TV]* 7
Praises New Policy Course *[PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 7
Hockey Star Disappears, Defection Presumed *[TASS]* 7
U.S. Foundation Received at Foreign Ministry *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 7
Latvian Prime Minister Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 8
U.S. Diplomats End 2-Day Visit to Lithuania *[Vilnius International]* 8
Illinois Governor Signs Agreements with RSFSR *[Moscow Radio]* 8

China

Sino-Soviet Trade Fair Holds Promise for Future *[TRUD 18 Jul]* 8
Lukyanov Meets With China's Peng Chong *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jul]* 9

Northeast Asia

Japan Still Sees 'Soviet Military Threat' *[Biryukov on TASS]* 9
ROK, DPRK Agree on Events Marking Liberation *[TASS]* 10
Scholar Discusses Economy of Asian Region *[Moscow International]* 10

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Policy Change on Cambodia Examined Further *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 11
Elicits 'Ambivalent' Responses *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 12
Pros, Cons Assessed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jul]* 13
ASEAN Ministers View Policy *[Shchedrov on Moscow International]* 13

Near East & South Asia

India's Prime Minister Singh Concludes Visit 14

Meets With Ryzhkov on 23 Jul *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jul]* 14
Attends Monument's Unveiling *[TASS]* 14
Meets With Gorbachev 24 Jul *[Moscow TV]* 15
Receives Trade Pact Proposal *[Delhi Radio]* 15
Discusses Economic Agreement *[Delhi Radio]* 16
Reaches Accord on Information *[Delhi Radio]* 16
Describes Indo-Soviet Relations *[TASS]* 16
Reviews Bilateral Ties *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 16
Agrees To Promote Cooperation *[TASS]* 17
Attends Farewell Ceremony *[Moscow Radio]* 18
PRAVDA Covers Singh-Gorbachev Meetings 18
Comparison of Gorbachev's Speech 18
Comparison of Singh's Speech 18
Comparison of Joint Statement 18
Rogachev, Indian Counterpart on Mutual Interests *[TASS]* 19
Shevardnadze, Indian Counterpart Discuss Ties *[Moscow TV]* 19
Successful Indian, Soviet Trade Meeting Noted *[Delhi Radio]* 19
Growing 'Discord' Among OPEC Members Examined *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 19

Sub-Saharan Africa

End to Angolan Conflict, Fair Elections Needed *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 20
Deputy Foreign Minister Receives Angolan Envoy *[Moscow International]* 21
Gorbachev, Comoran President Exchange Cables *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 21
'Temporary Respite' Noted in Ethiopian Conflict *[Moscow International]* 21
Gambian Foreign Minister Exchanges Telegrams *[TASS]* 22
Kenyan Opposition Supports Multiparty System *[Moscow International]* 22
Niger Students Stage Sit-In at Embassy in Moscow *[AFP]* 22
Somali Rebels Seize Soviet Trawler *[TASS]* 22
Somali Leader Accused of Perpetuating Civil War *[Moscow International]* 23
South African Foreign Minister Interviewed *[NEW TIMES No 29]* 23
Ugandan Government, Opposition Sign Accord *[Moscow International]* 26

East Europe

Gerasimov Holds News Conference in Czechoslovakia *[Moscow Radio]* 26
CSFR Reportage on Visit *[cross-reference]* 26
Foreign Trade Minister Begins Moscow Talks *[Prague Radio]* 26
Costs of Troop Withdrawal From GDR Assessed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Jul]* 26
GDR Embassy Adopts Edict on Asylum for Jews *[TASS]* 29
FRG, GDR Reactions to Kohl Visit Contrasted *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Hungary Demands Condemnation of 1956 Events *[Moscow Radio]* 29

West Europe

3 Red Army Soldiers Seek Asylum in FRG *[Hamburg DPA]* 30
Abalkin Arrives in FRG for Economics Talks *[TASS]* 30
Soviet Hijacker To Be Extradited From Finland *[Helsinki Radio]* 30
French Premier Says USSR Needs Support *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 31
Communist Party's Falin Meets FRG Businessman *[TASS]* 31
Maltese Diplomats Received at Foreign Ministry *[TASS]* 31
Swedish Government Appealed To Retain Hijacker *[Stolkholm DAGENS NYHETER]* 32
Chaplin, Turkish Envoy Discuss Bilateral Ties *[TASS]* 32
United Kingdom's Policy on Cambodia Examined *[Malikov on Moscow Radio]* 32

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

28th CPSU Congress

Gorbachev's Congress Performance Assessed *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 28]* 33
Congress Resolution on Response to Letters *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 34

Congress Delegates View Leaders' Reports *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 34
Delegates Polled on Results of Congress *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 29]* 39
Chief Editor Assesses Outcome of Congress *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 15 Jul]* 40
CPSU Congress Editorial Apparatus Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 28]* 42

Political & Social

Presidential Decree on Foreign Economic Ties *[TASS]* 43
Presidential Decree Bans Armed Units 43
Decree Announced *[TASS]* 43
Decree Explained *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Kalugin Charged With 'Divulging State Secrets' *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jul]* 44
Kalugin Challenges Polozkov for Parliament *[MOSCOW NEWS No 29]* 44
Preparations of New Union Treaty Work Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jul]* 45
Revenko on Possible New Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 45
Revenko Contends Single State 'Predetermined' *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Prokofyev Views Party, State Function Division *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Workers in Far East Protest Nuclear Submarines *[AFP]* 47
Gorbachev Holds Conference on Union Treaty *[PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 47
Gorbachev's Post-Congress Status Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 47
Details of AUCCTU Plenum Revealed *[TRUD 21 Jul]* 51
Ivashko, Dzasokhov, Others Discuss Party, Issues *[Moscow TV]* 52
Ex-KGB Major's Revelations Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 58
Patriarch Warns Against Social 'Anarchy' *[PRAVDA 17 Jul]* 61
Soviet Study of Ethno-Politics Discussed *[SOYUZ No 26]* 63
Legalities of Property Distribution Examined *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 66
Moscow Defense Plants Exhibit Civilian Products *[Moscow Radio]* 70
New Rubric in 'Political Dialogues' Cycle *[Moscow TV]* 70
Publishers Combine To Pressure Paper Producers *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 70

Economic

Sitaryan Announces Currency Regulations *[TASS]* 71
Ryzhkov Answers Questions on Economy *[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No. 29]* 72
Abalkin Supports Unemployment Relief Fund *[TASS]* 73
Chamber of Commerce's Tasks, Problems Reviewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY 21-27 Jul]* ... 73
Directors Appeal to Government for Supplies *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 18 Jul]* 75
Ryazan Bids To Hike Consumer Goods Production *[Moscow TV]* 75
Problems of Defense Industry Conversion Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 76
Implications of Economic 'Pluralism' Viewed *[PRAVDA 16 Jul]* 76
Ministry Opposes Shipping Line's Switch to Lease *[Moscow TV]* 78
Gossnab Official Discusses Gasoline Shortage *[Moscow Radio]* 79
New Car Undergoes Road Trials *[Moscow TV]* 80
Trans-Siberian Railroad Electrification Planned *[Moscow TV]* 80

Agricultural

Yegor Stroyev Views Agrarian Issues *[TASS]* 80
Harvesting Campaign Hampered by Shortages *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 81
Favorable Grain Harvest Prospects Noted *[Moscow International]* 81
Kuban, Don, Stavropol Harvest Progress Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 20 Jul]* 81
Weather, Crop Conditions Reported in Mid-July *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 19 Jul]* 82
New Small Combine Harvester Begins Testing *[Moscow TV]* 82

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts To Make Space Walk 26 Jul *[Moscow Radio]* 83
Cosmonauts' Research Program Summarized *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 83
New Instrument Helps Locate Water Main Leaks *[Moscow TV]* 83

Military

Moiseyev Attends General Staff Party Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Jul]* 83
Moiseyev Remarks on New Military Encyclopedia *[TASS]* 86
Military Aviation Firm Holds Open Day *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jun]* 86

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 24 Jul Council Session 87
Draft Enterprise Law Debated 87
Budget Discussed 87
Tax Structure Discussed 88
Reform Program Viewed 88
Debates Continue 89
Prunskiene Addresses 24 Jul Council Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 90
Lithuanian Delegation Arrives in Moscow *[TASS]* 91
Lithuania's Kuzmickas on Talks With Moscow *[Moscow International]* 91
Prunskiene Interviewed on Moscow Talks *[Moscow TV]* 91
Lithuanian Views of Talks With Moscow Examined *[PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 91
Minister Coordinates Moscow Treaty Principles *[Vilnius International]* 93
Oil-Shale Mining Damages Estonian Environment *[Tallinn International]* 93
Repeal of Moscow Cartel in Estonia Demanded *[Tallinn International]* 94
Patriarch Aleksiy Meets Estonian Leaders *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]* 94
Estonian Party Secretary Gusev Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jul]* 94
Draft Treaty on Union, Latvian Relations Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 97
No Observer Status for Baltic States at CSCE *[AFP]* 97

RSFSR

Russian Parliament Forms Human Rights Committee *[TASS]* 97
Tasks of RSFSR Economic Council Described *[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 28]* 98
New Moscow Newspapers, Radio Station Announced *[Moscow Radio]* 100
Peat Bog Fires Threaten Gas Pipelines *[TASS]* 101
'600 Seconds' Program Temporarily Off Air *[TRUD 21 Jul]* 101
Leningrad Gas Shortage Linked to Baltics *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 101
Leningrad Komsomol Transfers Enterprises *[TASS]* 101
Sverdlovsk Soviet Chairman Voted Out *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 29]* 102
Democratic Party of Russia Created in Kazov *[Moscow TV]* 102
Government Wants Compensation for Rostov Plant *[Moscow TV]* 103
Rostov Oblast's Food Supply Problems Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jul]* 103
Kemerovo Signs Deal With Italian Food Firm *[Moscow TV]* 103
Cholera Outbreak Reported in Stavropol *[TASS]* 104
Unauthorized Meeting Demands Kumyk Sovereignty *[Moscow Radio]* 104
Industrial Accident Affects Bryansk Water Supply *[TASS]* 104
Terminal Under Construction at Sochi Airport *[Moscow TV]* 105

Western Republics

Belorussian Draft Sovereignty Declaration Examined *[Moscow Radio]* 105
New Belorussian Foreign Minister Appointed *[Moscow TV]* 106
Belorussia Hopes To Fund Chernobyl Compensation *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 106
New Moldavian Party Bureau Holds First Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 10 Jun]* .. 106
Amendments to Moldavian Constitution Published *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 10 Jun]* 107
Kiev Public Transport Workers Stage Strike *[TASS]* 107
Workers' Demands Met; Strike Ends *[Moscow TV]* 108
Reportage on Hoisting Ukraine Nationalist Flag 108
Raising Flag Considered 'Illegal' *[Moscow Radio]* 108
National Flag Ceremony Held *[Kiev International]* 108
Chernovtsy Decision Disputed *[Kiev International]* 108

Kravchuk Addresses Ukraine Supreme Soviet *[Kiev International]* 109
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Adopts AES Appeal *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 109
Pickets Block Khmelnitskaya AES *[Moscow TV]* 109
New Agricultural Trade Union Formed in Ukraine *[Moscow Radio]* 110

Caucasus

Armenian Supreme Soviet Resumes Work *[Moscow Radio]* 111
Armenia Issues Bonds for Future Purchases *[Yerevan Radio]* 111
Armenian Parties Discuss National Congress *[Yerevan Radio]* 111
Editor Views Satellite News From Armenia *[Yerevan International]* 111
Immediate Measures To Disarm Armenians Announced *[Moscow TV]* 111
Attacks on Armenian Villages in NKAO Reported *[ARMENPRES]* 112
Official Visits Border Rayons, Security Viewed *[Baku Radio]* 112
Disgraced Leader May Attend Azerbaijan Congress
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Jul] 112
Aliyev Meeting in Nakhichevan Attracts Crowd *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jul]* 112
Party Officials Discuss Election Preparations *[Baku Radio]* 112
Azerbaijan's Mutalibov Views Moscow Meeting *[Baku Radio]* 113
Liberal Democratic Congress Held in Tbilisi *[Moscow TV]* 113
Hijacker Faces Charges in Sukhumi *[Moscow TV]* 113

Central Asia

Kazakhstan's Nazarbayev Tours United States *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 114
New Trade Union Newspaper Published in Alma-Ata *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Further on Interethnic Tension in Osh Oblast 114
Official on Judicial Inquiry *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Official Cited on Investigation *[Moscow TV]* 115
59 Percent Return to Work *[TASS]* 115
Tear Gas Used in Clashes *[Moscow International]* 115
Situation 'Again Exacerbated' *[Moscow Radio]* 115
Update on Osh Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Internal Troops Sent to Uzgen *[Moscow TV]* 116
Tajik Trade Union Paper Begins Publication *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Uzbek Leader Views Party's Current Role *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 116

Canadian Minister Clark's 'New Thinking' Lauded

LD2407192290 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Canada's minister for external affairs, Joseph Clark, proposed creating a mechanism of security in Northern Asia, similar to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. During bilateral consultations with his Japanese counterpart Taro Nakayama in Tokyo, Clark explained that representatives of Japan, Canada, USSR, the United States, and China could meet informally without drafting an agenda and expecting quick results in order to begin a process aimed at terminating the cold war in Asia and promoting detente as effectively as in East and central Europe last year.

Clark told a briefing later that some conflicts in the Asia-Pacific region were the direct product of the cold war. Canada believes, he said, that countries of northern Asia need a relevant mechanism enabling them to meet, remove differences and promote a lasting peace and stability.

The statement by the Canadian minister provides yet another proof of effective new thinking, comprehension of the realities and imperatives of our time, the growing integrity of the world and interdependence of states. They are in line with the proposals and ideas, which were advanced for the biggest time by Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostock four years ago and developed in Krasnoyarsk two years later.

At that time the Soviet leader called on all states in the Asia- Pacific region to promote cooperation in the name of peace and security, proposed discussing the issue of creating a negotiating mechanism for any proposals relating to security in Asia and the Pacific Rim, made quite specific proposals on this score. Some of them have been and are implemented. At that time he proposed, in particular, to discuss on a multi-sided basis ways to diminish military confrontation in northeastern Asia—in areas where the shores of Japan, USSR and China, North and South Korea are close.

Ideas, similar to Soviet ones, have been recently advanced by South Korean President No Tae-u, who suggested that representatives of Moscow, Washington, Beijing, Tokyo, Pyongyang and Seoul meet to exchange views on measures to ease tensions and build up confidence in Northeastern Asia. Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu also declared readiness to begin discussion with the same countries.

Now comes another proposal from a representative of a Pacific country, Canada. In response, the Japanese foreign minister doubted the possibility of creating any negotiating structure immediately. But he made a counter proposal. Kaifu proposed an unofficial meeting between foreign ministers of Asian and Pacific countries this September during the next session of the UN General Assembly. Clark agreed to holding this "intermediate" meeting on the eve of the conference of countries in northern Asia and the Pacific.

The impressive swift changes in the world, especially in Europe, have definitely reached the Asia-Pacific region. Favourable prospects are shaping up here today in eliminating seats of tension, settling regional problems, and strengthening peace and stability through the joint efforts of various countries. In this region confrontation must be replaced by dialogue and understanding. The important thing now is not to lose the chance of promoting perestroyka and improving international affairs in this part of the world as well.

Clark Backs Economic Dialogue

LD2507074990 Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT 25 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo July 25 TASS—"It is the very active position of the Government of Canada that the Soviet Union should be involved in the international economic community," Joseph Clark, Canadian secretary of state for external affairs, told a news conference here on Tuesday.

"We were very active in Houston in making a proposal that there be a very positive response to Mr. Gorbachev's specific request of the Houston summit for a sustained economic dialogue," Clark told TASS.

Canada has been "very active and recently successful in trying to have a relaxation of Cocom rules with respect to the Soviet Union" and has been working with respect to the Soviet Union in the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade (GATT), he said.

Having referred to the Soviet Union as "neighbour and unique partner" of Canada, Clark said that western countries want to help but do not want to waste their help. This is why, he said, Canada was very active in urging and achieving the agreement by the Group of Seven to involve international institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in a very short term study to be reported back by the end of this year.

"We think that the Gorbachev reforms can draw some momentum from the authority of cooperation with the IMF, the World Bank and other proposals," Clark said.

With regard to the Soviet Union's economic cooperation in the Pacific that is a matter that is under continuing discussion, he added.

Clark elaborated on the idea, which he set out during the meeting with his Japanese counterpart Taro Nakayama on Monday, to establish a mechanism of cooperation in ensuring security in the Asia-Pacific region.

"The fact that the cold war is over in Europe is a reason to intensify the search for peace in the Pacific," he said.

declaring in particular in favour of adaptation to the Pacific region of confidence and security-building measures which have proven successful in Europe.

These might include advance notification of military manoeuvres, an open-skies regime, facilities for crisis management and conflict resolution and data exchanges, he said.

The first move in this respect could be to launch a dialogue in the northern Pacific involving the Soviet Union, the United States, Canada, Japan, China, and, possibly, both South and North Korea, Clark pointed out.

Touching upon the issue of "northern territories"—the group of south Kuril Islands that are the object of Tokyo's territorial claims on the Soviet Union—Clark said that this "is obviously a very difficult question."

This is why, he explained, "Canada worked with Japan to ensure that there was specific reference in the Houston communique to that issue because it is an issue of such evident and central importance to the relations between Japan and the Soviet Union."

The KYODO News Agency admitted, however, that Clark refrained from directly supporting the stance of the Japanese Government which makes "the return of the islands" a precondition for direct economic support to the Soviet Union.

Moreover, Clark was clearly unenthusiastic about Tokyo's attempts "to internationalise" the "northern territories" issue.

"This is a bilateral matter and it is going to be resolved bilaterally," Clark told TASS.

First Meeting of CSCE Scheduled in New York

LD2507075790 Moscow TASS in English 0734 GMT 25 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington July 25 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will host a meeting of foreign ministers of states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in New York from October 1-2, the State Department said in a notice for the press.

It said that the purpose of the first CSCE meeting to be held in the United States "will be to prepare for the proposed CSCE summit, which, as President Bush and his NATO colleagues agreed earlier this month, would include the signature of a CFE agreement (agreement to Reduce Conventional Forces in Europe) and set new standards for the establishment and preservation of free societies."

The ASSOCIATED PRESS predicted that the CSCE summit in Paris this November "could produce a number of other steps to reduce East-West tensions."

TASS Covers Gremitskikh 24 Jul Briefing

Iraq-Kuwait Tension

LD2407133490 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh today regretfully noted recent Iraq-Kuwait tension.

Speaking at a news briefing here, he voiced confidence that "the two states, which have so much in common, will find it possible to prevent the exacerbation of the situation and resolve the problems that have arisen as good neighbours, as fraternal Arab countries, on a mutually acceptable basis."

He added that "this is certainly being helped by the Arab League's efforts towards this end."

OPEC Ruling on Oil Prices

LD2407134290 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today expressed hope that the OPEC conference in Geneva slated for July 25 "will find correct decisions" concerning the prices of crude oil.

Speaking at a news briefing, Yuriy Gremitskikh said the recent decline in the price of crude oil has been linked by experts to an oil glut, because some OPEC countries exceed the production quotas agreed upon last May.

"As major oil exporter, the Soviet Union favours the normal functioning of the world economic system and stable oil prices at a reasonable level," he said.

Gorbachev-Andreotti Talks

LD2407134790 Moscow TASS in English 1342 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Giulo Andreotti and Mikhail Gorbachev may hold a joint news conference next Thursday [26 July] during the Italian prime minister's working visit to Moscow, which starts on Wednesday evening, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He said that Andreotti and Gorbachev will first hold talks on Thursday at the same time as the foreign ministers. Gianni de Michelis and Eduard Shevardnadze, hold their meeting. The programme also provides for negotiations with broader participation.

Andreotti is to leave for home after the news conference, Gremitskihk said.

Indian Prime Minister's Visit

LD2407141390 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Vishwanath Pratap Singh chose Moscow as the first foreign capital to visit in his capacity of Indian prime minister, attesting to the continuance of the Indian leadership's foreign policy, Soviet Foreign Ministry's spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a news briefing here today.

The Indian leader is now on an official visit to the Soviet Union.

People in the Soviet Union highly appreciate India's contribution to building new international relations, which were made possible by perestroyka and the Soviet Union's new foreign policy, Gremitskikh stressed.

People in the Soviet Union are confident, he said, that Soviet-Indian cooperation will be favourable for East-West relations, for the solution of North-South problems and the emergence of a new world economic order.

Gremitskikh said that on Tuesday Singh was scheduled to meet First Deputy Defence Minister and Chief of the General Staff General of the Army Mikhail Moiseyev and members of the Indian community at the Indian Embassy. He will also participate in a ceremony of unveiling a monument to Rabindranat Tagore and attend a ceremony at Moscow State University, during which a medal and an honorary doctorate will be presented to the Indian leader for remarkable services to science and literature.

The Indian prime minister is due to leave Moscow for Tashkent by plane on Wednesday. He will meet the leaders of Uzbekistan there and take in the sights in Bukhara and Samarkand.

Summary of News Conference

LD2407162890 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Vishwanath Pratap Singh chose Moscow as the first foreign capital to visit in his capacity of Indian prime minister, attesting to the continuance of the Indian leadership's foreign policy, Soviet Foreign Ministry's spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a news briefing today.

The Indian leader is now on an official visit to the Soviet Union.

Gremitskikh announced that Giulio Andreotti, Italian prime minister, would start his working visit to Moscow in the evening on July 25.

The programme provides for his talk with Soviet President Gorbachev and talks between the foreign ministers of the two countries.

The press centre of the CPSU Central Committee will begin its work by a news conference of Aleksandr Dzasokhov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the Oktyabrskaya Hotel tomorrow, Gremitskikh continued. He expressed the view that Dzasokhov will hold this news conference as a Central Committee secretary for ideology.

Yuriy Gremitskikh regretfully noted recent Iraq-Kuwait tension. He voiced confidence that "the two states, which have so much in common, will find it possible to prevent the exacerbation of the situation and resolve the problems that have arisen as good neighbours, as fraternal Arab countries, on a mutually acceptable basis."

Yuriy Gremitskikh spoke about the recent decline in the price of crude oil on the world market.

"As major oil exporter, the Soviet Union favours the normal functioning of the world economic system and stable oil prices at a reasonable level," he said.

Gremitskikh told journalists that Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy will visit Norway and Sweden this week to hold political consultations on international issues and preparations for the 45th session of the UN General Assembly.

A Soviet spokesman hailed the results of the meeting of representatives of five permanent members of the UN Security Council of Cambodian settlement, held in Paris on July 16-17.

Yuriy Myakotnykh, deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Directorate for Socialist Countries of Asia, briefed journalists on progress in the Cambodian settlement reached at the Paris meeting.

"We regard the U.S. decision to revise its policy towards Indochina as very important," the spokesman said. "We think that these adjustments proceed in the right direction, enabling to step up the entire diplomatic process of negotiations and to involve key forces, including those of Vietnam, in it."

The Soviet Foreign Ministry's historic and diplomatic department deputy head Georgiy Kynin spoke at the briefing.

He referred to recent publications in the East German press describing burials discovered on a territory where special camps used to be located.

He said there had been a total of ten special camps, some of them replacing former Nazi extermination camps where Soviet prisoners of war were held.

The Soviet diplomat did not rule out the possibility that the remains were not only of Germans, but also of Nazi victims.

Myakotnykh Lauds Results of Cambodian Meeting

LD2407155190 Moscow TASS in English 1529 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—A Soviet spokesman hailed the results of the meeting of representatives of five permanent members of the UN Security Council on Cambodian settlement, held in Paris on July 16-17.

Yuriy Myakotnykh, deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Directorate for Socialist Countires of Asia, briefed Soviet and Foreign journalists in Moscow today on progress in the Cambodian settlement reached at the Paris meeting.

Myakotnykh said, in particular, that by the time of that meeting the talks at intra-Khmer level had stalled, regional-level talks were in a complex situation, the direct dialogue between Vietnam and China failed to give any concrete results.

Hence the importance of the fact that the five-nation meeting in Paris succeeded in finding compromise formulas on Cambodian structures of power in the transition period, the mechanism of holding nationwide elections in this country, and military aspects for the problem.

Myakotnykh described U.S. decision to adjust its policy vis-a-vis Indochinese states, primarily Vietnam, as a step contributing to the settlement of the conflict.

"We regard the U.S. decision to revise its policy towards Indochina as very important," the spokesman said. "We think that these adjustments proceed in the righ direction, enabling to step up the entire diplomatic process of negotiations and to involve key forces, including those of Vietnam, in it."

Asked by a journalist, Myakotnykh said a new Soviet approach to the Cambodian settlement was revealed at the Paris meeting. It consists in recognising the need to focus attention on preparing elections in Cambodia.

"Let Cambodian people themselves say what system and leaders they want," he replied.

Ministry Official on 1945-50 German Camps

LD2407155590 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Special camps in the Soviet occupation zone in Germany existed between 1945-1950, in compliance with the declaration on the liability of Nazis for committing atrocities. The declaration was adopted by the anti-Hitler coalition members, the Soviet Foreign Ministry's historic and diplomatic department deputy head Georgiy Kynin told a briefing here today.

He referred to recent publications in the East German press describing burials discovered on a territory where special camps used to be located.

He said there had been a total of ten special camps, some of them replacing former Nazi extermination camps where Soviet prisoners of war were held.

The Soviet diplomat did not rule out the possibility that the remains were not only of Germans, but also of Nazi victims.

Archives reveal that 122,671 Germans passed through the camps between 1945-1950—45,262 of them were released, over 14,000 transferred to the East German Interior Ministry and 756 sentenced to death by military tribunals. Some 43,000 people died of various diseases, mainly tuberculosis.

Accusations that Soviet occupation forces deliberately annihilated prisoners on a mass scale, find no support in archival documents, he said. There is no proof either that children were kept in special camps.

"The losses depress, but they cannot be compared with the loss of millions of Soviet people who were killed without trial and investigation at the hands of Nazis," Klynin said. He said that loss were part of the grand total of the war unleashed by the Nazi Germany.

Data and copies of documents from Soviet archives were handed over to East German Interior Minister Peter-Michael Diestel, who visited the Soviet Union between July 20-23.

Gorbachev Sends Message to World Scout Congress

LD2407150690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has sent greetings to the World Congress of Scouts. The greetings say:

With respect, I greet your congress, and the noble and humane aims of your movement, which unites young people from many countries of the world. I cordially thank you for your help to Soviet children who suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident. It is good that the possibility has arisen for Soviet youth to get acquainted and make friends with the Scout movement, with old prejudices and mistrust having been mutually discarded. Perhaps it is your generation that will bring mankind's cherished dream closer in reality: to live without hostility and violence, in an atmosphere of clarity and goodness in relations between peoples of the most varied nations and countries. I wish you success.

Leaders, Politicians Congratulate Gorbachev

PM2407102390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Congratulations Telegrams"]

[Text] Comrade M.S. Gorbachev is still receiving telegrams from party and soviet organizations and individual citizens in connection with his election as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The messages convey cordial congratulations and very best wishes.

Congratulations are also being received from the leaders of communist, worker, and other parties and organizations, heads of state and government, and prominent public figures abroad. The following have sent telegrams, in particular:

Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Liberation Movement of Angola-Party of Labor and president of the People's Republic of Angola;

Athos Fava, chairman of the Communist Party of Argentina, and Patricio Echegary, general secretary of the Communist Party of Argentina;

Air Force Captain Jerry John Rawlings, Ghanaian head of state and chairman of the Provisional National Defense Council of the Republic of Ghana;

Lieutenant General 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih, chairman of the Presidential Council of the Yemen Republic and general secretary of the National People's Congress;

No Tae-u, president of the Republic of Korea;

Walid Junblatt, chairman of the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon;

Benazir Bhutto, prime minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan;

France Albert Rene, general secretary of the Seychelles People's Progressive Front;

H.-J. Vogel, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

Western Views on German Unification Assessed

PM2407135190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 First Edition p 5

[Article by Vasiliy Pustov under the "Observer's Remarks" rubric: "NATO: Who Is Afraid of What"]

[Text] It is astonishing how appreciably an assessment of an exceptionally significant phenomenon, that is expected or even obviously happening, can sometimes change. Here is a graphic example. In connection with the recent stormy events in the two German states, rumors, conjectures, and opinions were insistently being circulated about the Soviet Union's supposed desire to prevent their unification. And that this was allegedly happening against the ardent wish not just of the Germans themselves, but of other NATO member states. The idea then even emerged that German unification should be halted by our actions, so that the responsibility for it would be laid on us, and we would be set at odds with the Germans, as M.S. Gorbachev said in his May interview for the American TIME magazine.

Incidentally, such a desire to use someone else to do the dirty work, so to speak, could be observed in the past. In this connection I remember when, at the beginning of the 1950s, Paris, Bonn, London, and other Western capitals bandied about the idea of creating a so-called "European army" which would be a first attempt to legalize the policy of remilitarizing the FRG. Even before this idea collapsed in 1954, some French colleagues admitted to us Soviet journalists during a conversation in Paris, in an outburst that was not without an element of cynical candor, that many people, even in influential French circles, were opposed to this dangerous venture but were not openly saying so, hoping that the Soviet Union's resolute opposition would do the trick.

It seems to me that we are observing something similar in our times. But all these calculations have no realistic basis. In any event, this conclusion was drawn at the Soviet-West German meeting which took place a few days ago. Its participants acted in a spirit of realism, thoughtfully, constructively, and above all responsibly, before the peoples of our two countries, taking into account their basic interests and concerns, and in the spirit of responsibility for the future of the whole world community. I want to concentrate on just two examples. Unified Germany, after a transitional period of 3-4 years, will receive full sovereignty with the right to join whichever alliances it wants. At the same time it has been laid down that, after the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the territory of the former GDR, there will be no nuclear weapons or foreign forces there. The future Bundeswehr, as Chancellor H. Kohl stated, is to be reduced to 370,000 men, that is, by almost 250,000. This will also be a contribution to the implementation of the policy of preventing the threat of war from ever issuing from German soil again.

The future of German unification and its consequences for Europe, particularly in the light of the results of the Soviet-German talks and the third meeting of the "Six," are being discussed positively in the West both in general and on an official level. But this, I repeat, is in general and on an official level. If you analyze the situation more attentively, you cannot fail to notice what I would call a latent reaction, testifying to a certain watchfulness.

The gross utterances by British Secretary for Trade and Industry Nicholas Ridley are significant in this connection. For example, he called the plans for economic, currency, and financial unification of West Europe a "German racket" aimed at "taking over" Europe. And although this cost Ridley his minister's portfolio, he is not alone in his worries. Many other British politicians share them and express them—obviously not in such a shameless form. Thus, answering the question of whether it is possible that the unified Germany will take on itself the role of leader in Europe, Foreign Secretary D. Hurd said: "I don't think that anybody wants that to happen. I don't think that it is in the United States' interests.... A U.S. presence (in Europe) is absolutely necessary to ensure stability, and we have learned this lesson from the fact that we went down the wrong path in 1920 when, as a result of the signing of the peace agreement in Europe, the Americans left—which led to tragedy 20 years later."

And how is the United States looking at all this? It is noteworthy that unlike President G. Bush, who has given a high assessment of the Soviet Union's actual consent to the united Germany's membership in NATO, the U.S. press is giving a rather more restrained assessment. And THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent's report from Bonn voices a clear warning: "Kohl is now dominating the international arena. One of the reasons for this is the fact that Germany's political power is creating a danger for Europe in the same way that Soviet military power did over 45 years. Now, the weakening of the USSR has reduced U.S. influence in the Old World."

Paris is occupying a special position. Thus, Defense Minister J.-P. Chevenement says that France has nothing to fear from a unified Germany. At the same time, however, he makes the reservation that Germany may not only become the leading economic force in Europe, but also "will become a territory that is open in the east to the influence of the Soviet system," because there is a "tradition of German-Russian accord." Paris sees the panacea for all this in preserving and increasing its military, and particularly nuclear power, in establishing military cooperation with the other European nuclear power—Britain—and in placing Franco-German relations at the center of the creation of a "West European defense formation."

These, in brief, are the opinions expressed in the West as to the future development of events in Europe in connection with the upcoming resolution of the German problem. They testify to specific fears among the NATO powers. And not only in the economic sphere. They cannot fail to be concerned about the likely growth of German influence in NATO, in particular with respect to the future of nuclear forces in Europe, and their reduction or withdrawal. A different prospect, outlined by the British FINANCIAL TIMES, does not suit Washington, London, or Paris either: "As soon as Germany is unified, and the rights of the four victorious powers are annulled, U.S. and other Western forces will only be able to stay in Germany if they receive a renewed invitation."

However, wherever and whatever opinions may be expressed, one thing is clear: It is only through the joint efforts of all European states that it will be possible to construct new relations that will ensure stable security on the continent.

United States & Canada

Senate Panel Approves Aid to East Europe

PM2407144190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "News in Brief"]

[Text] 20 Jul—The U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved a bill on aid to Eastern Europe. It will amount to $535 million. Within the framework of the bill it is planned to set up business centers to help U.S. businessmen intending to establish business links with the region's countries. At the same time, it was decided to authorize the administration to send U.S. advisers to the Soviet Union "to assist the implementation of the democratic and financial reforms."

U.S. Vietnam Veterans Group Meets Ryzhkov

LD2307194190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Comrade Ryzhkov received members of the U.S. delegation from the National Vietnam Veterans Coalition that is in the Soviet Union, headed by (Thomas Birch), its president, and an official of the U.S. Supreme Court. The issue of rendering assistance in getting POWs released was discussed, in particular the issue of the release of Soviet servicemen held in captivity by the Afghan opposition.

Praises New Policy Course

PM2507084990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation in the Kremlin"]

[Text] N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received 23 July a group of members of a U.S. delegation from the National Vietnam Veterans Coalition headed by Thomas Birch, its president and member of the U.S. Supreme Court, which is paying a visit to the Soviet Union.

The U.S. representatives spoke with deep respect of the Soviet Union's present peace-loving foreign policy course and welcomed the new trends in USSR-U.S. relations—the end of the "cold war" and the move away from confrontation to trust, mutual understanding, and cooperation.

They discussed questions of assistance in freeing prisoners of war and, in particular, the question of freeing Soviet servicemen captured by the Afghan opposition.

The head of the Soviet Government voiced a high opinion of the humane thrust of the activity carried out by the U.S. veterans' organization and wished it success.

I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and P.V. Shetko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Affairs of Internationalist Soldiers, took part in the conversation.

Hockey Star Disappears, Defection Presumed

LD2407114690 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Seattle July 24 TASS—Rising Soviet ice-hockey star centre Sergey Fyodorov disappeared from the national team on Sunday, dealing it an unexpected psychological blow before a crucial showdown with the United States.

After nearly a week in the United States, the Soviet side arrived in Kenvik for qualifying matches at the Goodwill Games. They have played the United States twice, losing the first match 1:3 and winning the second - 5:3. The second game went astray with the guests spending 87 minutes in the penalty box and the hosts—63.

Local journalists hinted that Fyodorov asked U.S. immigration authorities for permission to stay in the United States.

On Sunday, Fyodorov returned with his teammates to the hotel after the game, went down to have dinner, but never made it to the dining hall. Soviet team officials and organising committee representatives said they did not know his whereabouts.

Fyodorov, 20, has been playing for the Soviet Army club CSKA for the past few years and was a centre on the Soviet Union last two world championship teams. In May, Fyodorov's term of army service expired, and he was demobilized. He was then drafted by the Detroit Red Wings of the National Hockey League.

Neither Red Wings officials nor NHL leaders have made any comments on the incident. According to the TBS TV network U.S. immigration officials hinted that they had no intention of granting political asylum to Fyodorov.

Under an agreement with Goodwill Games organisers, immigration authorities decided not to consider asylum requests and said that they will deport athletes who make such requests.

Goodwill Games-1990 organising committee president Bob Walsh said he will hold a news conference on the incident.

U.S. Foundation Received at Foreign Ministry

PM2407154990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy has received a delegation of the U.S. 22d Century Foundation headed by A. Easton, which is in Moscow at the invitation of the USSR Social Inventions Fund.

Latvian Prime Minister Holds News Conference

LD2407135290 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash]

[Text] Washington July 24 TASS—Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis, who is on a private visit here, held a news conference at the National Press Club on Monday.

Speaking about the situation in the USSR, he said that moves towards sovereignty by various republics continue. They started in Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and then spread to the Russian Federation and the Ukraine. Godmanis recalled that on May 4 the Latvian Supreme Soviet set the goal of "restoring our independent state, our place in a united Europe."

According to him, Latvia hopes to become a full-scale member of the United Nations. Previous to 1940, it was a member of the League of Nations.

"But we are fully aware that during the transition period we cannot sever economic and political relations with union republics, prior to the beginning of talks with the Soviet Government. It is especially important to switch to the market economy, and this will be a very difficult period for our people," he said.

The Latvian premier also raised the issue of work on the union treaty which is conducted, as he emphasised, under the guidance of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Godmanis expressed the hope that the treaty would help create "a sort of association" within the framework of the Soviet Union.

"Although we are going to become a politically independent state in the future, we would like the Soviet Union to remain our good neighbour and we are interested in preserving and maintaining good economic relations with it," he continued.

During his stay in Washington, Godmanis met with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker to discuss the situation in the Baltics.

U.S. Diplomats End 2-Day Visit to Lithuania

LD1907224390 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 19 Jul 90

[Text] (John Perno), the United States Deputy general consul in Leningrad, and two officials of the United States Embassy in Moscow have completed their two-day visit in Lithuania.

The American diplomats were received by the Lithuanian vice premier Romualdas Ozolas, and they also met the Lithuanian foreign minister Algirdas Saudargas, who had just returned from Washington.

Illinois Governor Signs Agreements with RSFSR

LD2307135490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Silayev, the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, has received Thompson, governor of the U.S. state of Illinois, who is visiting our country at the invitation of the Russian government. Questions of Soviet-U.S. relations and development of various kinds of ties between the RSFSR and Illinois were discussed. Agreements on partnerships were signed.

China

Sino-Soviet Trade Fair Holds Promise for Future

90UF0345A Moscow TRUD in Russian 18 Jul 90 p 3

[Article by TRUD correspondent A. Sukhotin: "Harbin Meetings"]

[Text] Harbin, July—**The first trade fair at the Soviet borders elucidated the prospects and problems of direct ties.**

It is as though Harbin had gone back into history for a time. In the central streets of the city, whose architecture at first glance makes one think about the Russian presence not so long ago, the Russian language was heard once again. Immigrant women, embracing their compatriots from the Union, wept in the tiny courtyard of the Orthodox church which remains intact. Even the restaurant with Russian cuisine on Central Street had real food experts for a couple of days....

But about 3,000 Soviet businessmen, who were guests of the trade fair arranged especially for them, still thought more about the present and the future. The northern province of Heilongjiang, which borders on the USSR, challenged the traditional trade fair monopoly of the southern Guangzhou, and this new step in opening up to the outside world gave much promise and hope for the future to both sides.

These hopes were not unfounded. In recent years direct ties and border trade have not only become a reality but have begun to change from a peripheral Cinderella into a competitor to state trade—last year their share accounted for one-third of the overall volume of $3 billion.

"The tendency continues to gather force," thinks the director of the Soviet exposition, A.I. Balabay. "The volume of all transactions concluded in Harbin, including protocols of intentions, has not been calculated yet. But we expect that it will reach approximately $2 billion. Both sides have a clear desire to move further. After the trade fair the Chinese partners are invited to the USSR. For them our country is an immense and promising market where they intend to become established. It is no accident that representatives of the largest companies and enterprises throughout China came to Harbin, although formally the trade fair was restricted. It

is remarkable that the Soviet and Chinese sides are trying not to limit themselves to the framework of simple barter but are entering into more progressive forms of cooperation, right up to the point of organizing joint enterprises and joint penetration into the markets of third countries. Within the framework of commercial secrecy I shall say only that questions of building enterprises for producing video tape recorders in the Moscow suburb of Zelenograd with Chinese participation or deliveries to the known plants of Mikrokrigenmash of a unique technology for reducing gases were decided quickly and easily. And this involved many millions of dollars."

Of course they have not yet managed to get rid of the old disease—the traditional exchange of Chinese consumer goods for Soviet raw material. But with the changeover to accounts trade must become more rational. This, incidentally, involves another problem—the lack of experience on the part of representatives of our enterprises that have gained entry to foreign markets. It is their sacred right to dispose of their products and funds. But would it really be any worse for their labor collectives if before concluding transactions the emissaries from the USSR consulted with the trade specialists who had come to Harbin about world prices for various kinds of goods? For their lack of experience and excessive arrogance result in considerable losses.

It would not hurt to prepare for the trade fairs better either. The experience of our partners is applicable here. Take just the excellent reference guide "How to Trade With the Soviet Union." In it you will find all the necessary recommendations, instructions, and decrees, right down to the forms of various contracts. We can only dream about such an aid, although several institutes and departments in the country work with Chinese problems.

Now everybody is preparing for the USSR trade and industrial exhibit in Beijing which is earmarked for September. Time will not stand still—businessmen on both sides of the border are aware of this. As concerns the Harbin people, judging from everything, they have been able to turn it back to their own advantage and they are none the worse for it. After all, Mercury, the god of trade, as we know, was inclined to encourage enterprisingness and perseverance.

Lukyanov Meets With China's Peng Chong

PM2507081990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "NPC Delegation Received"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received a delegation from the PRC NPC [National People's Congress] headed by Peng Chong, permanent (first) deputy chairman of the NPC Standing Committee, in the Kremlin 21 July.

A.I. Lukyanov told the Chinese guests about the results of the 28th CPSU Congress, the work that is being done in the country to implement the tasks of perestroyka in the socioeconomic and political spheres, and the efforts aimed at consolidating international stability and peace and developing interstate cooperation. Great attention was paid to the multifaceted activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its committees and commissions, and people's deputies.

Peng Chong gave a detailed report on the activity of the PRC NPC. The PRC's political and socioeconomic development in conditions of the stabilization of the situation and the NPC's role in this process were also described.

During the conversation, both sides noted with satisfaction the progressive development of good neighborly Soviet-Chinese relations since the May 1989 summit. They stressed the significance of the further deepening and broadening of contacts and cooperation in various spheres, including ties between the top and local organs of state power, in the interests of strengthening the friendship and good neighborliness between the Soviet and Chinese peoples and of ensuring peaceful development and security and stability in Asia and the Pacific and throughout the world.

The sides wished each other success in the solution of the tasks facing the two countries' peoples.

I.D. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union; USSR People's Deputy N.Ya. Sychev; and Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation, which was held in a friendly atmosphere.

Northeast Asia

Japan Still Sees 'Soviet Military Threat'

LD2407130190 Moscow TASS in English 1013 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Japanese military leaders reacted strangely to the call by their prime minister to take into account changes in the international situation during the elaboration of a regular military appropriations plan, the implementation of which will begin from next fiscal year.

When meeting them last Friday, Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu told them that there was growing sentiment among the group of seven leaders in Houston in favour of giving support to the Soviet Union.

Kaifu wanted Japan's future defence policy, and the 1990 "white paper on defence", which will be issued in September, to reflect such changes and be tailored to the epoch of detente.

On Sunday representatives of the National Defence Agency reached agreement with the Japanese Finance

Ministry on a 5.9 percent increase in the country's defence appropriations for next year.

Japan's National Defence Agency reluctantly admits that the Soviet Union is effecting large-scale cuts in its Armed Forces in the Far East and the specific measures it has taken signify the Soviet Union's transition to the strategy of defence sufficiency, proclaimed by it and based on new political thinking.

Japanese Defence Agency leaders say, however, that the military situation in the region does not give ground for changing estimates formulated in the 1976 military programme and calling for a military build-up in order to be able independently to repulse "a limited-scope aggression".

While welcoming unilateral cuts in the Soviet land forces in the Far East, they, nevertheless, insist that on the whole the "Soviet military threat" in the area "persists."

Without such remarks, it will not be easy for the advocates of the Japanese military build-up to secure new funds to purchase AWACS planes and refuelling aircraft, which considerably extend the range of military aviation, to construct the newest combat ships and to buy missile weaponry.

The stubborn emphasis on the "persisting military threat" enables those politicians, as they put it, "to keep pace with the progress of military technology."

It is apparent that while calling on others to disarm, Tokyo still prefers to continue to build up its arms in defiance of the world's growing tendencies towards relaxation of tension, confidence building and disarmament.

ROK, DPRK Agree on Events Marking Liberation

LD2307120690 Moscow TASS in English 1148 GMT 23 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kopnov]

[Text] Tokyo July 23 TASS—South Korea accepts North Korea's proposal to hold a rally in Panmunjom on August 15, this year, and then a pan-Korean demonstration to mark the 45th anniversary of the country's liberation from Japanese colonial domination, the South Korean ministers for national reunification, justice and defence at a joint news conference today, the YONHAP news agency reported from Seoul.

Details about the organisation of these activities are expected to be discussed at a regular meeting between representatives of North and South Korea in Panmunjom on Friday.

Originally Seoul rejected Pyongyang's initiative and stated that it would not allow a South Korean delegation to take part in the rally—numerous opposition and dissident groups in the country demanded participation. According to the authorities, such purely propagandistic moves would not promote the reunification of Korea. Instead, South Korean president No Tae-u last week suggested opening the joint border "in the area of Panmunjom from August 13 for five days, allowing people to visit freely both the North and the South of the country. However, the North rejected this initiative.

"The South Korean government will allow all would-be participants to take part in the contemplated independence day demonstration which will begin at the foot of Mount Pektu on the territory of North Korea and end at the foot of Mount Halla in South Korea," South Korean Minister for National Reunification Hong Song-Choe told today's news conference.

"In addition," he said, "we are ready to help prepare the rally in the northern part of Panmunjom."

"South Korea, for its part, hopes that North Korea will now also accept the proposal of President No Tae-u to open a section of the joint border for several days," he said.

Scholar Discusses Economy of Asian Region

SK2407014590 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 16 Jul 90

[Text] "Can the Model of the Asia's Newly Industrialized Countries Be Useful to the Soviet Union?" (Yevgeniy Kasyanov), Soviet scholar and doctor of historical sciences, discusses this question in the magazine NOVOYE VREMYA.

He says as follows: Debates continue on how to develop our country. In this endeavor, even the question of adopting an authoritarian ruling system is being raised. As evidence that prosperity can be achieved without democracy, the cases of Asia's so-called newly industrialized countries are often cited. The newly industrialized countries described as little tigers or dragons for their achievements are Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.

As for the phenomena that the tigers have been successful, there is no mystery whatsoever. The secrets of the phenomena have already been made known to everyone.

The main secret, above all, is adequate strategy. The governments of the aforementioned countries have consistently maintained adequate strategy ever since the sixties. The basic ingredient of the strategy is market economy. In the four countries, the governments regulate the market economy by economic, administrative, and legal means.

Another secret of their success, needless to say, is to maintain political stability. Toward this end, these governments are no means discriminatory. For instance, in Singapore, the opposition parties, trade unions, publications, social organizations are under strict control. Struggling against the existing system and questioning the

government's strategy of development are forbidden. At the same time, direct criticism of the prime minister is not allowed.

The experiences of the Asia's newly industrialized countries are tempting the Soviet Union to put on tiger skins. Some people say that democracy can be temporarily put aside and efforts should be concentrated on our pending task. They say that we can think about freedom after we have achieved prosperity. However, I don't think we can do this.

The Asian tigers' experiences are not applicable to us. For instance, let us think of what has taken place in Singapore. The Lee Kuan Yew government had not launched a revolution when it seized power in 1959. At that time, Singapore was already under the social system that we habitually call the capitalist system and it was, above all, under the private ownership of the means of production. At the same time, foreign capital was allowed to flow into the country. The government just continued to maintain the existing system.

However, at that time, the leftist elements demanded severance from the Western capital, the plundering of the exploiters, the socialization of the means of production, and the infusion of the proletarian ideology into the working people.

If the Singapore rulers had been in a weak position and had given in to pressure, the country would have faced a political and ideological battle and socially fallen into chaos in production. Worse still, the radicals might have seized power.

We know what happens when radicals attempt to build an ideal society.

The Soviet society is facing an entirely different task. The task is not to defend the existing economic system from the ultra-leftist experiment but to remake the society fundamentally and revolutionarily. Can this task be accomplished by order and by whip? It is very questionable.

In essence, what is argued is whether to abandon the ideology which has been very appealing to the people of broad strata, who are poor and resentful, and to return to the old ideology in which the gap between the poor and the rich is regarded as something normal—this ideology has been cursed many times.

Will the period of suffering, in which our people are giving up the ideology which they have very deeply believed in and which has been theoretically very attractive and humanitarian to them, end soon? This is doubtful.

The escape from dogmatism has just begun and success is never guaranteed. The method of having strong leadership like that adopted by the tigers is not enough for us. Such a method will never bring our country into the ranks of those civilized nations which are flourishing.

Only when we wake up and become wise, only when we have gone through all the trials, and only when we have been driven into a corner under the current economic system, will possibilities appear.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Policy Change on Cambodia Examined Further

PM2407095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Gennadiy Baryshnikov in 'Viewpoint': "Dialogue or Confrontation?"]

[Text] Cambodia is one of the world's trouble spots. And for all its remoteness, more and more people in the world are realizing the need for the speediest peaceful resolution of this protracted armed conflict. A conflict in which it is not only the interests of the opposing sides that clash.

The peoples can no longer countenance this development of events. For all too long mankind has been seeking world peace. It cannot allow a regional conflict, wherever it occurs, to disrupt this peace.

The quest for ways of securing an all-embracing peace settlement in Cambodia is becoming wider and wider. The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are doing active work. The Governments of Australia, Thailand, and Japan have definitely been active this year, putting forward their own settlement plans and acting as intermediaries in the organization of inter-Khmer dialogue.

The leadership of the State of Cambodia has set its sights on the speediest achievement of a just peace settlement, while displaying initiative in widening the dialogue with the opposition and a willingness for compromise and cooperation with the governments of neighboring countries and international organizations, above all with the United Nations.

The Phnom Penh government is gaining authority in the country and in the international arena not only for its flexible approach to the resolution of the conflict, but also for its ability to control the situation in the country and effectively tackle vital social and economic questions.

The Cambodian leadership is aware that the lofty goals of independence, freedom, and neutrality it has proclainmed cannot be realized on Cambodian soil as long as some of its compatriots are continuing to suffer in jungles and camps abroad and are deprived of the basic things in life. Not to mention the fact that the laws of the Pol Pot regime deprive the "Khmer Rouge" of the right to take charge not only of his destiny, but his life.

The results of the latest round of the discussion by representatives from the USSR, United States, Britain, France, and China of ways of achieving a political

settlement of the Cambodian conflict, which ended in Paris this week, also give hope that this goal is attainable.

Delegations from the Cambodian sides were not present at the meeting.

A document was adopted in Paris urging the warring sides to stop combat actions in Cambodia and to sit down at the negotiating table and reach agreement on the question of creating a Supreme National Council—the future supreme organ of power, comprising authoritative representatives of the Cambodian people—to wield power in the country during the transitional period. The representatives of the "five" reached mutual understanding on determining the direction of the Cambodian administration's activity on questions connected with the activities of armed groupings on Cambodian territory until general elections under UN auspices are held in the country. They advocated the accelerated elaboration of a procedure for holding free elections and for the activity of an international mechanism to monitor the withdrawal of foreign troops from Cambodian territory, observance of the cease-fire accords and the halting of military aid from abroad, and the establishment of international guarantees for the settlement process.

A characteristic point in this connection is the decision by the U.S. Administration to no longer recognize the tripartite coalition headed by Prince N. Sihanouk as the Cambodian representative in the United Nations. It is common knowledge that, whether the Americans liked it or not, their assistance to the groupings of N. Sihanouk and Son Sann, including military aid, inevitably also reached the "Khmer Rouge," whose barbaric methods of government are condemned worldwide.

Soviet people are keeping a close eye on the development of events in friendly Cambodia and voice the hope that there will be a peaceful settlement of the conflict as soon as possible.

Elicits 'Ambivalent' Responses

PM2407150390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Review by V. Ganshin: "Ambivalent Reaction to Dialogue on Cambodia"]

[Text] As already reported in IZVESTIYA, the United States has made a number of proposals since the Paris meeting devoted to settling the Cambodian conflict. They pursue—at least, so it seems today—two aims: First, by embarking on a direct dialogue with Vietnam, the United States is reckoning on securing more opportunities to influence the settlement process. And, second, by refusing henceforward to support the "Khmer Rouge" at the United Nations, Washington will be able to have wider scope for diplomatic maneuvering, not being linked with the Pol Pot forces' odious regime.

However, the new U.S. stand, expounded in Paris by Secretary of State James Baker, has elicited an ambivalent reaction. But this was only to be expected, considering the fact that the sides involved in this conflict frequently pursue not just different but even directly opposite ends, giving support to one rival grouping or the other.

PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman Qin Guihua made a practically unequivocally negative assessment of the U.S. initiative. Speaking at a news conference in Beijing, he declared: "Cambodia's UN seat must not remain vacant until a comprehensive political solution to the Cambodian problem is reached."

Replying to a request from journalists to comment on the U.S. decision announced by J. Baker to begin a dialogue with Hanoi, Qin emphasized that this "concerns only relations between the United States and Vietnam." He added, however, that "from China's viewpoint the chief reason for the impasse in the conflict, which has lasted more than 10 years, is the 'tough stand' taken by Vietnam and the Phnom Penh government." He also said that "China will continue supporting the 'Khmer Rouge' until Vietnam withdraws all its troops from Cambodia under UN control and a comprehensive political solution to this problem is reached."

According to a French Foreign Ministry spokesman, France welcomes the U.S. decision to begin talks with Vietnam with a view to preventing the accession to power of armed Khmer Rouge formations. "This is a positive aspect," D. Bernard said, "which will contribute to the peaceful resolution of the Cambodian question." He said that an EC working group will examine the U.S. position at its meeting in Brussels Friday.

It has to be said that a whole number of states, mainly European ones, have already made it clear that they will advocate stripping the Pol Pot forces of the right to represent Cambodia at the United Nations if a political solution to the Cambodian problem has not been reached by the opening of the next General Assembly session.

This position elicits a particularly negative reaction among representatives of the coalition. Thus Norodom Sihanouk, who is thought to be in Pyongyang, has sent a telegram to Beijing for journalists in which he sharply stigmatized the U.S. position. According to him, this will only cause the coalition which he heads to intensify the struggle. "Our exclusion from the United Nations and the de facto recognition of the Vietnamese presence in Cambodia will help to strengthen the determination of the forces of national resistance to continue and to activate their just and holy war for Cambodia's liberation."

The 67-year-old opposition leader went on to declare: "The U.S. decision to betray the Cambodian resistance movement and to exclude it from the United Nations is an act of the greatest injustice."

A rather cool reaction to the decision announced by J. Baker came from the ASEAN countries. Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas voiced doubt that the U.S. ending of diplomatic support for the Cambodian resistance movement would help to resolve the conflict in Cambodia. At the same time, he said, Indonesia and the ASEAN countries will not prevent the United States from implementing its plan to begin a dialogue with Vietnam and the Phnom Penh government if it considers that this will help to find a comprehensive solution to the Cambodian problem. According to the minister, this question will be examined during the annual meeting of ASEAN countries' foreign ministers next week.

Pros, Cons Assessed

PM2507082790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 First Edition p 3

[By V. Vinogradov "International Comments": "The Beginning of Movement?"]

[Excerpts] It seemed that the latest round of discussion among representatives of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council on ways to achieve a political settlement of the Cambodian conflict, which was held in the French capital, would not produce anything unexpected. [passage omitted]

And yet the unexpected did occur in Paris, but at the news conference held at the end of the round. Speaking at that news conference, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker did indeed astound his listeners. He stated that the United States ceases to recognize the tripartite opposition coalition headed by Prince Sihanouk as the representative of the State of Cambodia at the United Nations while the Khmers Rouges remain part of it, and intends to take the most active measures to prevent the return of Pol Pot's supporters to power in the country. To this end, Baker said, Washington is ready to start dialogue with Vietnam on the question of a Cambodian settlement. [passage omitted]

This unexpected shift in Washington's "Cambodia policy" was naturally received far from uniformly. Those who are sincerely interested in a just settlement of the situation in Cambodia were bound to welcome it. [passage omitted]

However, the U.S. initiative received a negative assessment not only in the Cambodian opposition camp, where Sihanouk described the White House move as a "betrayal of its friends" and threatened that the decision would lead to an intensification of the "just struggle" against the Phnom Penh regime. In Beijing, Qin Guihua, representative of the PRC Foreign Ministry, stated that his country considers the rigid stance adopted by Hanoi and Phnom Penh to be the main cause of the Cambodian stalemate and will support the Khmer Rouge.

The Bush administration's decision also came under criticism on Capitol Hill. Especially that part of it which states that Washington will continue to give aid to the supporters of Sihanouk and Son Sann. "It is worth asking," said George Mitchell, Democrat leader in the Senate, "why the United States will continue to finance these forces if they not only do not oppose the Khmers Rouges but fight alongside them against the Phnom Penh authorities."

It is to be hoped that in future Washington will make an even more radical shift in the reassessment of its "Cambodia policy." But for the time being it should be noted that the change already announced could exert a beneficial influence upon the whole process of the Cambodian settlement.

ASEAN Ministers View Policy

BK2507105390 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1500 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Commentary by Oleg Shchedrov]

[Text] The annual meeting of ASEAN foreign ministers was opened in Jakarta on 24 July, during which the attention of the meeting participants was focused on the Cambodian problem. Even though the ASEAN countries actively support the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea [CGDK], which is opposed to the Phnom Penh government, they have played an important role in initiating political dialogue between the two opposing sides.

For the past few weeks, the Khmer Rouge have clearly intensified their combat operations against the Phnom Penh government. The new upsurge in fighting has practically thwarted the cease-fire, which had supposedly taken place in Cambodia, and set the political dialogues back to square one. Therefore, the emerging crisis will become the main topic of discussion among the six members of the regional grouping.

However, there is a more complicated problem, namely, how to cope with a reversal of the regional policy of the United States, which is obviously not a minor player in the Cambodian drama. Until recently, Washington also supported the CGDK. However, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker recently announced that the White House no longer supports the CGDK seat at the United Nations. He also announced the plan to hold direct talks on the Cambodian issue with Vietnam. Observers believe the U.S. move was prompted by the growing strength of the Khmer Rouge, which plays a key military role in the CGDK.

Washington has so far been alone in this move. Beijing and Tokyo hurriedly voiced their support for the CGDK, while London is still not sure what to do. What about ASEAN's reaction? Initial predictions state that ASEAN will give a negative response. "We in ASEAN honestly doubt that the U.S. move will help efforts to find a solution to the Cambodian problem," said Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas. However, not long ago it was Ali Alatas who accused the Western countries of supporting the Khmer Rouge. Now, when the United

States has initiated a concrete move to isolate the Khmer Rouge, Ali Alatas' stand sounds inconsistent. Perhaps other ASEAN members have a better idea on how to make the Cambodian dialogues work smoothly, while at the same time keeping the Khmer Rouge from returning to power. The Jakarta meeting must indeed provide an answer to this question.

Near East & South Asia

India's Prime Minister Singh Concludes Visit

Meets With Ryzhkov on 23 Jul

PM2407190390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Soviet-Indian Talks"]

[Text] Conversations and talks took place in the Kremlin on 23 July between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and V.P. Singh, prime minister of India, who is in Moscow on an official, friendly visit.

Welcoming the Indian Government head, N.I. Ryzhkov stressed that V.P. Singh's visit signifies continuity in the maintenance and deepening of the intensive Soviet-Indian dialogue at the top level, which sets the tone and pace of work of the entire complex mechanism of cooperation and collaboration between our countries in both bilateral and international affairs.

For his part, V.P. Singh stated the present Indian leadership's commitment to the line of the all-around development of the time-tested relations of traditional friendship and mutually beneficial cooperation with the Soviet Union.

The heads of government noted the vitality and permanent value of the 1971 Soviet-Indian Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation. They stressed the significance of the joint contribution of India and the Soviet Union to the positive processes which have begun in the world and to civilization's movement toward a new world order in the spirit of the ideas and philosophy of the historic Delhi Declaration.

During the talks there was a subject-by-subject discussion of the whole range of questions of trade-economic and scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and India.

The sides agreed that in the international arena, where the views of the USSR and India on all the key questions are either close or coincide, their cooperation with one another may be viewed as exemplary.

Outlining the question of its foreign policy priorities, the Indian side drew attention to the V.P. Singh government's efforts to establish constructive dialogue with neighboring countries in South Asia and settle existing bilateral problems in a spirit of good-neighborliness. In this connection the Soviet side was told about the steps which India is taking to ease the tension which has arisen in relations with Pakistan over Kashmir.

N.I. Ryzhkov noted that tribute is paid in the Soviet Union to India's goodwill and efforts to remedy the situation in South Asia and improve relations with its neighbors. He stated that the Soviet Union opposes all foreign interference in India's internal affairs. The Soviet side expressed solidarity with India in its efforts to solve the Kashmir problem with Pakistan by a political path and peaceful means in accordance with the Simla agreement.

There was an exchange of information on the political and socioeconomic situation in the two countries and on the character of the processes taking place in various spheres of life in the Soviet Union and India.

N.I. Ryzhkov characterized the features of the present stage of perestroyka in the USSR in light of the results of the 28th CPSU Congress' work.

V.P. Singh expressed a sincere wish for the success of perestroyka in the USSR. The prime minister stressed that people in India have been watching with keen attention the transformations in the USSR and the renewal of the political, economic, and social structures on a democratic basis, and sincerely wish the Soviet policy of perestroyka success. In turn he described the main directions of the Indian Government's activity and domestic policy priorities.

The heads of government noted the great significance of the Soviet-Indian political dialogue and advocated the continuation of close contacts at the level of the two countries' leaderships.

Taking part in the talks for the Soviet side were L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; M.A. Moiseyev, first deputy defense minister; V.F. Isakov, USSR ambassador to India; I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister; and V.V. Sitnin, USSR deputy finance minister: and for the Indian side, M. Dandavate, finance minister; A.K. Nehru, commerce and tourism minister; I.K. Gujral, foreign minister; A.S. Gonsalves, Indian ambassador to the USSR; M. Dubey, secretary for foreign affairs of the Indian Foreign Ministry; and N.N. Vora [name as transliterated], secretary of the Defense Ministry.

The talks were held in a warm, confidential, and friendly atmosphere typical of Soviet-Indian dialogue.

Attends Monument's Unveiling

LD2407164190 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and visiting Indian head of government Vishwanath Pratap Singh unveiled a monument to

Rabindranath Tagore, an outstanding Indian author, philosopher and public figure, in the picturesque Druzhba Park in north-western Moscow today.

The four-meter bronze statue, installed on a massive granite pedestal, was executed by scuptor K. Ch. Pal and is a gift to the Soviet capital from friendly India.

The name of Rabindranath Tagore, Asia's first poet and Nobel prize laureate, is well known in the Soviet Union. He was one of those who laid down the groundwork of Soviet-Indian friendship. Praising the USSR's contribution to human culture after his trip to moscow in 1930, he wrote: "If I had not been here, the pilgrimage of my life would have been left incomplete."

Tagore's works opened India's soul to Soviet people. His statements about the integrity and interrelationship of the diverse world, his firm belief in the need to fuse peoples and cultures in greater unity, the triumph of reason and moral principles are relevant also today.

The Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear weapon-free and non-violent world, asserting the ideals of mutual understanding and trust and proclaiming that human life should be recognised as the supreme value, is the reflection of these humanist ideas in the policy by the USSR and India

The monument of Rabindranath Tagore "will symbolise the Soviet people's deep respect for the memory of this outstanding artist-humanist, poet and thinker and will, simultaneously, be a symbol of friendship of the Soviet and Indian peoples," Ryzhkov said at the ceremony to unveil the monument.

Ryzhkov noted the importance of Singh's visit to the USSR, since both countries "are now working to put their huge natural and human potential at the service to the people, convert advances in science and technology to the benefit of their peoples, bring out their creative potentialities and ensure harmony in inter-ethnic relations."

According to Ryzhkov, "The two countries' movement towards these goals will simultaneously become their worthy contribution to mankind's progress."

In his speech, Singh emphasised that the monument would symbolize the friendship and closeness of Soviet and Indian peoples. He expressed the view that the tradition of accounts between Soviet and Indian intellectuals, poets and artists enriched both countries' cultures. "In unveiling this monument, we are making a contribution to further strengthen our cultural ties," Singh said. he expressed conviction that the Indian and Soviet peoples would continue to learn from each other.

Meets With Gorbachev 24 Jul

LD2407152390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The visit to our country by Indian Prime Minister Singh is continuing. The Indian prime minister was received in the Kremlin today by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. There was a warm and friendly conversation, touching upon various aspects of both our bilateral relations and of the international situation as a whole. Afterward, Indian journalists asked Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev several questions. Replying to them. Mikhail Sergeyevich said, in part:

[Begin recording of interpreter in English] Well, I believe that Soviet-Indian relations are special and they have their own independent points. The current visit by Mr. Singh, the Indian prime minister, is at the same time both a confirmation of the continuity of Soviet-Indian relations and, I must say, also of further progress. Therefore, friendly relations with India and the great Indian people are for us something greater than simple relations with any particular country. They are already a tradition and, in my opinion, they are what our peoples and the world need. [end recording] [video shows Gorbachev, Singh, and officials sitting and standing]

Vishwanath Pratap Singh, the Indian prime minister, also made a trip today to the capital's Gagarinskiy rayon. Jahawarlal Nehru Square is situated here, where monuments have been erected to Mahatma Gandhi and Indira Gandhi. The Indian prime minister laid flowers at the monuments erected in honor of the great Indian political figures and statesmen. [video shows laying of flowers]

Receives Trade Pact Proposal

BK2407125490 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1230 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] The Soviet Union has expressed its desire to conclude a long-term trade agreement with India and diversify their growing economic relations. A proposal to this effect was made by the Soviet side during Prime Minister Mr. V.P. Singh's second round of talks with President Gorbachev [as heard] in Moscow today. The delegations of the two countries are also participating in the wide-ranging talks. The Soviet side is headed by Prime Minister Ryzhkov.

While Mr. Singh gave an overview of the developments in the subcontinent, the Soviet side expressed appreciation of India's serious concern at Pakistani involvement in Jammu and Kashmir.

In the morning, Mr. Singh visited the monument of Mahatama Gandhi on Moscow's Lemonosov Avenue and paid floral tributes. Speaking on the occasion, he said relations between India and the Soviet Union are comprehensive and are at an important stage in their development.

The external affairs minister, Mr. I.K. Gujral, had a meeting with the Soviet deputy prime minister, Mr Yuliy Vorontsov, who is the cochairman of the India-Soviet Joint Commission on Trade and Cooperation along with

Mr. Gujral. They had extensive discussions on expanding India-Soviet cooperation in various fields.

Meanwhile, the two sides have decided to continue talks at the expert level on rupee-ruble trade agreement after Mr. Singh's visit. The decision was taken today when Finance Minister Professor Madhu Dandavate had extensive discussions on India-Soviet trade and economic cooperation with Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Mr. Konstantin Katushev. The Soviet prime minister had earlier given an assurance to Mr. Singh that rupee-ruble bilateral agreement will continue up to 1995.

Discusses Economic Agreement

BK2407161490 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] India and the Soviet Union have reiterated their commitment to further strengthen and broaden bilateral relationship on the basis of their perceptions. Both the countries asserted that constant contact is necessary for achieving this objective. This is made clear after the second round of delegation level talks that the prime minister, Mr. V.P. Singh, had with President Gorbachev in Moscow today. The two leaders also had one-to-one talks for nearly two hours.

Mr. Gorbachev told the Indian delegation that India-Soviet relations are not just based upon history but provide us a powerful base for continuing them. The Soviet president appreciated the National Front government's efforts for improving relations with neighboring countries in the Asian region, including China. He said there is scope for close cooperation between India, Soviet Union, and China. During the one-to-one talk, Mr. Singh and Mr. Gorbachev had further discussions on the framework on economic agreement.

The prime minister complimented Mr. Gorbachev for his courage in introducing perestroyka. Mr. Gorbachev said initially his ideas were called illusions, but they have become hard realities. The prime minister pointed out that similar problems are faced in India as we have inherited stereotypes and old systems and approaches.

The Soviet side expressed its desire to conclude a long-term trade agreement with India and diversify their growing economic relations.

Our special correspondent Devprasad Das reports from Moscow that the Soviet Union appreciated the prestige and position enjoyed by India in the Third World. Mr. Gorbachev made a special mention of India's independent stand on global issues and its contribution toward disarmament and a nuclear-free nonaligned world.

The Soviet president accepted an invitation from the prime minister to visit India.

Reaches Accord on Information

BK2407162990 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] India and the Soviet Union have agreed to strengthen and promote cooperation in the field of information. Our correspondent S. Mathais reports that the agreement reached between the two countries [during Indian-Soviet talks in Moscow] provides for exchange of information materials between news agencies of the two countries. It also provides for cooperation between broadcasting and television organizations and exchange of experience in publication, distribution, and marketing of government publications and journals. Among other things the agreement has a provision for setting up of exhibitions in each other's countries. The agreement will remain in force for five years with built-in provision for automatic renewals.

Describes Indo-Soviet Relations

LD2407130590 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Following a one-to-one meeting in the Kremlin, President Mikhail Gorbachev and Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh exchanged the latest-published volumes of the Soviet literature library in Hindi and the Indian literature library in Russian.

Journalists, availing themselves of a brief interval in the talks, asked the leaders of the two countries to describe the course of the dialogue.

Asked to compare the importance of Soviet-Indian relations vis-a-vis Soviet-Western relations, Gorbachev said that, in his view, Soviet-Indian relations "have special qualities and are significant in their own right" and that the Indian prime minister's current visit to the Soviet Union is "a reaffirmation of the continuity and further advance of Soviet-Indian relations" and introduces new elements to their content.

Asked to express in one phrase the essence of the current visit, Singh said that India and the Soviet Union "are future-oriented and have mapped out ways to maintain and strengthen Indo-Soviet friendship, which has always been the asset of the two countries' peoples."

Reviews Bilateral Ties

PM2407205190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Soviet-Indian Summit"]

[Text] At an official meeting in the Kremlin 24 July, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh discussed a broad range of international and bilateral problems in the context of the new stage in world development and the profound changes in their respective countries.

M.S. Gorbachev rated this visit as an act of continuity and trust, including at a personal level, capable of promoting USSR-Indian relations and giving additional dynamism to the Soviet-Indian factor in world politics.

They both noted the services of their predecessors who over decades shaped the unique character of Soviet-Indian relations based on the profound mutual sympathies of their peoples and the objective interests of both great states. These relations are having a positive effect on the situation in Asia and have played their role in the processes which led to the end of the cold war.

The joint statement signed yesterday was a fitting continuation of the celebrated Delhi Declaration, confirming the two countries' readiness to advance together into the 21st century on the basis of the principles formulated in these documents. We value the fact, M.S. Gorbachev said, that in the years of great changes the USSR and India remain side by side, demonstrating a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperating on a basis of a coincidence of interests on the fundamental present-day questions. He drew attention to the solidarity that V.P. Singh expressed with the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives and his readiness for more active dialogue on the cardinal problems of pan-Asian development.

Key aspects of world policy were touched on, the role of the improvement of Soviet-U.S. and Indian-U.S. relations was stressed, and note was made of the worldwide importance of the profound changes in Europe and the highly promising progress in relations between the USSR and China and between India and China.

M.S. Gorbachev noted India's constructive role in the Nonaligned Movement and the international significance of its contribution to normalizing relations with its neighbors. After discussing the situation concerning Afghanistan, the interlocutors confirmed the similarity of their positions. M.S. Gorbachev expressed full understanding and support for the prime minister on the aggravation of the situation in the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir.

V.P. Singh returned several times to the beneficial international consequences of perestroyka and the radical reforms in the Soviet Union, laying special emphasis on the unity of the Soviet state which, in his words, is of significance both for India and for the world community, not just for the peoples of the USSR.

The president and the prime minister agreed to begin without delay the preparation of a wide-ranging economic treaty between the USSR and India oriented primarily toward new forms of cooperation in the sphere of science, technology, and joint production. At the same time the preparation of the treaty will make possible a better understanding of the present state of affairs, will give impetus to decisions which must not be delayed, will provide an opportunity to think through all the mechanisms of contact not only at the top level but also at the level of enterprises and goods producers, and will determine the long-term prospect for economic cooperation.

In connection with the 20th anniversary of the Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation which falls in 1991, M.S. Gorbachev and V.P. Singh said that it should be extended and expressed a desire for the appropriate political, cultural, and economic initiatives to coincide with that date. A preliminary agreement was reached that the signing of the economic treaty and the extension of the present treaty could be timed for M.S. Gorbachev's next visit to India.

A large part of the conversation occurred one on one. Together with the delegations, the following took part in the talks: Ye.M. Primakov, L.A. Voronin, K.F. Katushev, M.A. Moiseyev, I.A. Rogachev, A.A. Maslennikov, O.V. Bastorin, and V.F. Isakov; and I.K. Gujral, M. Danavate, A.K. Nehru, B.G. Deshmukh, M. Dubey, A.S. Gonsalves, B. Dzhalan [name as transliterated], N.N. Vora [name as transliterated], M.S. Ahluwalia, P.Sh. Dzhkha [name as transliterated], V.N. Kaul, and R. Sen.

Agrees To Promote Cooperation

LD2507064290 Moscow TASS in English 0627 GMT 25 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov, Igor Peskov, Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow July 25 TASS—Kremlin talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev were the centerpiece of the second day of Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh's official friendly visit to the Soviet Union on Tuesday.

The two leaders agreed during the meeting to begin preparing a wide-ranging bilateral economic agreement without delay to promote first of all new forms of cooperation in science, technology and joint production.

Gorbachev and Singh favoured the extension of the Soviet-Indian treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation and expressed the desire to mark its 20th anniversary in 1991 with political, cultural and economic initiatives worthy of the occasion.

They tentatively agreed that the economic agreement could be signed and the treaty renewed during Gorbachev's next visit to India.

Gorbachev and Singh discussed a wide range of international and bilateral issues in the context of the new stage in world development and of thorough-going changes in the two countries.

Gorbachev pointed to the international significance of the Indian contribution to normalising relations with its neighbours.

When discussing the situation concerning Afghanistan, the two leaders reaffirmed the similarity of their positions.

The Soviet president expressed complete understanding and support for the Indian prime minister in connection with the aggravated situation in the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir.

Also on Tuesday, the Soviet and Indian heads of government continued official Soviet-Indian talks. Singh met with Soviet First Deputy Defence Minister Mikhail Moiseyev.

In addition, he placed wreaths to the monuments to Mahatma Gandhi and Indira Gandhi and the memorial plaque to Jawaharlal Nehru in Moscow and, together with Soviet counterpart Nikolay Ryzhkov, unveiled a monument to Rabindranath Tagore in the Soviet capital.

Singh flies from Moscow to Tashkent this morning. He will also see sights in Bukhara and Samarkand.

Attends Farewell Ceremony

LD2507082690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] An official farewell ceremony has just been held in St. George's Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace for Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh, who leaves for a tour of the country today. He is paying an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet leadership. USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his wife wished a warm farewell to Singh and his wife.

The cortege of cars, with motorcycle escort, has left the Kremlin for Vnukovo Airport.

PRAVDA Covers Singh-Gorbachev Meetings

Comparison of Gorbachev's Speech

PM2407154190

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 24 July 1990 in its Second Edition on page 5 carries a TASS report on the 23 July Gorbachev's speech at a Kremlin dinner for Indian Prime Minister Singh. The PRAVDA item, entitled "Speech by M.S. Gorbachev," has been compared with the Moscow TASS International in Russian version published in the 24 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 17-18, revealing the following variations:

Page 17, column two, paragraph five, sentence one of PRAVDA begins: [Text] Esteemed Mr. Prime.... (deleting first five paragraphs)

Page 18, column two, first complete paragraph, only sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...understand more clearly topical issues in bilateral cooperation.... (substituting "topical issues" for "priorities")

Comparison of Singh's Speech

PM2507085590

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 24 July 1990 in its Second Edition on page 5 carries a TASS report on the 23 July Kremlin dinner speech by Indian Prime Minister Singh. The PRAVDA item, under the general heading "USSR-India: Continuity and Stability" and entitled "Speech by V.P. Singh," has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published in the 24 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 18-19, revealing the following variations:

Page 18, column two, sixth complete paragraph, sentence one of PRAVDA reads: [Text] Your Excellency,.... (deleting first paragraph)

Same column, ninth complete paragraph, last sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...embarked on this hard but noble endeavor, with.... (adding "hard but")

Page 19, column one, first complete paragraph, penultimate sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...over the world more and more. There is hope.... (adding "more and more")

Same column, second complete paragraph, sentence one of PRAVDA reads: ...past four decades. Our relationship has continued to be as stable and resilient as ever, which has largely made it possible to change the international situation.... (rewording)

Same paragraph, sentence four of PRAVDA reads: ...Soviet Union has always stood steadfastly by.... (adding "always")

Same paragraph, sentence five of PRAVDA reads: ...of every Indian. No party and no change of government.... (rewording, deleting sentence)

Same column, third complete paragraph, last sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...is based and is an exceptionally necessary and useful document.... (rewording)

Same column, fourth complete paragraph, last sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...new challenges and far-reaching opportunities for diversifying.... (substituting "far-reaching" for "fresh")

Column two, second complete paragraph, last sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...intrinsic part of a wider process aimed at the realization of.... (rewording)

Comparison of Joint Statement

PM2407155790

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 24 July 1990 in its Second Edition on page 1 carries a TASS report of the text of the Soviet-Indian joint statement. The PRAVDA item, entitled "Soviet-Indian Joint Statement," has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published in the 24 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 16-17, revealing the following variations:

Page 16, column two, paragraph one, sentence one of PRAVDA begins: [Text] India and the Soviet.... (deleting first paragraph)

Paragraph four, sentence one of PRAVDA reads: ...of the most important achievements of the.... (substituting "important" for "remarkable")

Same paragraph, sentence four of PRAVDA reads: ...set the pace of the worldwide movement toward mutual understanding.... (adding "of the worldwide movement")

Paragraph five, only sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...new vistas for eliminating seats of tension, settling regional conflicts, and solving many other.... (rewording)

Paragraph seven, last sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...principle of equitable sharing of the burden of expenditure should be duly.... (rewording)

Page 17, column one, first complete paragraph, only sentence of PRAVDA reads: ...cannot but be multilateral, given the leading role of the United Nations, which.... (rewording)

Same column, second complete paragraph, sentence two of PRAVDA reads: ...European home will undoubtedly have its implications.... (substituting "undoubtedly" for "obviously")

Same paragraph, sentence three of PRAVDA reads: ...they be maintained on the pretext of defending against imagined threats. Europe.... (rewording)

Third complete paragraph, sentence two of PRAVDA reads: ...progress and prosperity.

The democratic spirit is gaining ground in the world today. This applies to interstate links, where there is a growing awareness that the key.... (rewording).

Rogachev, Indian Counterpart on Mutual Interests

LD2407095890 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev today met Muchkund Dubey, Indian first deputy minister of external affairs, who is currently in Moscow in connection with Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh's visit to the Soviet Union.

They considered a number of international issues of mutual concern, including the development of the situation in South Asia.

Shevardnadze, Indian Counterpart Discuss Ties

LD2507160990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze met Indian Foreign Minister Gujral. A detailed conversation was held on the present state and future of Soviet-Indian cooperation, the current situation in the world, and leading trends in international developments. The ministers noted the importance of the Soviet-Indian summit talks held in Moscow and the Soviet-Indian statement which was signed. The priority significance which the USSR and India attach to the development of multifarious links between the two countries and the active continuation of joint and parallel actions on the international arena were confirmed.

Successful Indian, Soviet Trade Meeting Noted

BK2507032990 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0240 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] Our special correspondent Devprasad Das reports [from Moscow] that during a meeting of the co-chairmen of the India-Soviet Joint Commission, it was decided to set up joint ventures soon in India. It was agreed that the work for conclusion of an agreement for resolving financial issues for such projects will start soon. The joint commission directed all working groups to take up appropriate action to set up an Indian trade center in Moscow and a Soviet trade center in Delhi and speed up shipment of cargo from ports from one country to the other. It was also agreed to hold the next session of the joint commission in October.

Talks were also held between the finance minister, Professor Madhu Dandavate, and the Soviet minister for foreign economic relations, Mr. Konstantin Katushev. During the talks both sides agreed to hold official level discussions next month on rupee-ruble parity.

Speaking to newsmen in Moscow last night, the external affairs minister, Mr. I.K. Gujral, said that the prime minister's visit to the Soviet union has been highly satisfactory. He said the prospects of the future of India-Soviet relations are very good. Mr. Gujral asserted that various issues of common global concern and of interest to our region figured during the prime minister's talks with the Soviet leaders. Answering a question, Mr. Gujral said Pakistan's assistance and support to subversive elements were discussed in detail. He said the Soviet side made it clear that it agrees to the Indian point of view on this issue and conveyed to Pakistan that the Soviet Union does not appreciate what Islamabad is pursuing and doing at present. Mr. Gujral will be having another round of talks today with the Soviet foreign minister, Mr. Shevardnadze, before leaving for Tashkent.

Growing 'Discord' Among OPEC Members Examined

NC2507103090 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Andreyev from "The World Today"]

[Text] Dear listeners, on 23 July Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani called on OPEC members to take immediate steps to increase the price of oil on the world market. The Iranian president made these remarks on the eve of a meeting among representatives of the OPEC member countries which will open in Geneva on 25 July. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes on this:

It is no exaggeration to say that oil is the lifeblood of contemporary civilization. The fate of many countries is linked with the state of the oil market. Some countries want to sell their oil while others want to buy. It is this formula that directly affects economic development in many parts of the world.

Because of the great significance of oil in the contemporary world, this product is no longer a mere commodity. The question of oil is becoming increasingly involved in politics and it is increasingly becoming a bone of contention among oil-producing countries.

The sharp fall in oil prices which began early this year was an unexpected phenomenon for all OPEC members. After the initial panic, the oil cartel members held an extraordinary session in Geneva because, in the view of this organization's experts, the main reason for the drop in oil prices was the great surplus on the world market.

After lengthy negotiations, the OPEC members reached an agreement on a production ceiling. However, it soon became obvious there is a great distance between an agreement on paper and the practical policy of many OPEC members. Each member is, first and foremost, interested in protecting its own interests and wants to gain foreign exchange at any price possible.

Obviously this approach does not allow the world oil market to stabilize. The situation is becoming more complicated each day. As a result, discord is exacerbating within OPEC. The members of this organization have condemned Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates [UAE], and Saudi Arabia for violating their production ceiling. In mid-June, Iranian Petroleum Minister Gholamreza Aqazadeh stated that actions by these countries are seriously harming the entire international system of oil transactions.

Recently, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn overtly threatened that he would resort to force if Kuwait and the UAE continue to violate the ceiling set for the production of black gold. It is interesting to note how the Tehran press has, in general, supported the statement by its worst enemy. The TEHRAN TIMES, which is close to the government, welcomed Saddam Husayn's remarks and pointed to the need to punish those who violate oil production ceilings.

In other words, the confrontation within OPEC is increasing and increasingly serious accusations and threats are being traded. This process is threatening the very existence of this organization. On Thursday morning, represpentatives will meet once again to slice up the OPEC pie. However, no one is certain whether they will be able to reach agreement.

Sub-Saharan Africa

End to Angolan Conflict, Fair Elections Needed

PM2307135190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Commentary by IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Pavlov: "We, the Americans, and the War in Angola"]

[Text] Luanda—A land pitted by craters resulting from explosions, burned-out tanks, armored personnel carriers, and trucks turned into a heap of metal. Destroyed houses, bridges, and roads. This is the typical "landscape" of modern Angola, where a senseless war has been going on for 15 years.

It has claimed more than 100,000 lives; hundreds of thousands have been made homeless and become refugees, and the material damage now exceeds $20 billion. But, despite this, the tragedy is continuing because the government and the opposition UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] grouping cannot find a compromise solution, although they are making efforts in that direction.

The possibility of positive progress became apparent in April this year, when representatives of the PRA [People's Republic of Angola] and UNITA began a direct dialogue in Portugal, which, however, was broken off because of great disagreements. Then the sides agreed on a new meeting. It was held in a suburb of Lisbon in an atmosphere of strict secrecy 16-18 June. According to data from informed sources, the possibility of the mutual cessation of combat operations by the People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola and by UNITA formations was discussed. The main differences in the sides' positions were apparent on questions of the means of realizing the proposed agreement and the schedule for disarming combat subunits. Therefore UNITA adopted a decision to recall its delegation for consultations and to continue contacts after eliminating the contradictions that had arisen. Even though the opposing sides are now relying on Portugal in this matter, it is obvious that it will hardly be possible to emerge from the impasse situation without the participation of the USSR and the United States, which have been drawn into the Angolan conflict.

Much is known about Washington's all-around support for UNITA. Let us recall that the United States is still giving this grouping military and financial assistance, which, according to U.S. sources, reaches $80 million a year. The plans of the U.S. Congress to allocate a one-shot additional payment of a similar sum to build up UNITA's military might were announced recently. According to statements by the leaders of this grouping, Washington intends to send it a considerable consignment of weapons in the very near future, including

antiaircraft missiles with a range greater than the Stinger, worth $10 million. It is proposed to make these funds available through CIA programs, and so all that is needed is the approval of the Senate and House Select Committees on Intelligence of the U.S. Congress. According to a WASHINGTON POST report, these committees have already approved such a request from the administration. In addition, the United States is giving UNITA other kinds of assistance. All this is being done despite the fact that, as the same WASHINGTON POST claims, the administration is "conducting an intensive discussion with the Soviet Union of ways to settle the conflict" in Angola.

How does the Soviet Union look in this 15-year war? We know that all this time our country has been supplying the PRA Government with arms and combat hardware, but so far not even the legislators have pictured the true size of our assistance in view of the secrecy that is maintained over this question. According to the U.S. Administration's estimates, last year it amounted to $800 million, 40 percent less than in 1988. Nor is it a secret to Western countries' representatives that a considerable number of Soviet military specialists are in Angola to service this hardware, as well as advisers to participate in drawing up operations, including offensive ones.

Do such operations always help to seek peace in the republic? One such recent offensive had the aim of taking the population center of Mavinga. When that aim was achieved, the Bush administration rebuked the Luanda authorities for "a dangerous escalation of the armed conflict" and evaluated the activity of the Soviet military specialists as "delaying the process of a settlement in Angola."

Are there any grounds for this accusation? It is not easy to understand the fine points of our policy in the matter of establishing peace in this African country. On the one hand, top Soviet leaders advocate resolving the Angolan problem around the negotiating table and they try to influence the PRA Government in just this way, while, on the other hand, Soviet military advisers recommend mounting an offensive against Mavinga the inadvisability of which seemed obvious even before it began. Indeed, the situation was sharply exacerbated as a result of the offensive. In order to defuse the situation, in the end the military command left Mavinga with the PRA president's approval and shortly after stopped the advance of its troops along the Cubango River toward the southern border. I would very much like to believe that this sensible step was suggested to the Angolans by our advisers in the spirit of a desire for a political settlement. But why then did the military advisers work on drawing up a senseless operation?

It was gratifying to learn from Western news agencies that the Soviet Union is ready to go further in the search for peace in Angola. THE WASHINGTON POST reported that the USSR has offered the U.S. Administration a considerable reduction in its military aid to the PRA Government if the United States ends the program of secret support for UNITA. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker declared at a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that any mutual reduction in U.S. and Soviet military aid to the two warring Angolan sides must be carried out within the framework of a common agreement providing for a cease-fire and for pledges that conditions will really be created for holding open, free, and fair elections.

Well, the Angolans themselves will decide what kind of elections to hold. But they must be helped in ending the war by both the Soviet Union and the United States, whose cooperation in settling conflicts in countries within their spheres of influence has already led in a number of instances to accords being reached.

Deputy Foreign Minister Receives Angolan Envoy

LD2407205190 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] In Moscow today Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov received Angola's ambassador to this country, Bernardo de Sousa. A number of aspects of Soviet-Angolan relations were discussed. The Soviet side supported the efforts of the Angolan Government to promote political settlement in the country.

Gorbachev, Comoran President Exchange Cables

PM2407132590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev has sent S.M. Djohar, president of the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros, a telegram conveying congratulations in connection with the country's national holiday—the 15th anniversary of independence.

In an answering telegram on behalf of the Comoran people and government and his own personal behalf S.M. Djohar expressed wishes for the further consolidation of friendship and cooperation between our countries.

'Temporary Respite' Noted in Ethiopian Conflict

EA2407205490 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 22 Jul 90

[By Vladimir Boris from the "East Africa Last Week" program]

[Text] The last week in Ethiopia—the most unstable country in the Horn of Africa—has been very quiet. However, as it has been in the past, this is only a temporary respite before a new, large-scale battle takes place between government troops and the liberation fronts of Eritrea and Tigray. During the past week, the former U.S. President James Carter, who has played an

important role in seeking a peaceful solution to Ethiopia's problems, announced that representatives from Addis Ababa and the Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF] would meet in Rome soon, but it remains to be seen whether the planned meeting will be successful this time.

The Government of Ethiopia is now quite willing to compromise with the opposition and is prepared to abandon its former hardline stance. It will be recalled that recently the government proposed a cease-fire and the formation of an interim government to include the opposition groups, provided the latter did not make demands inconsistent with Ethiopia's territorial integrity. The Eritreans, however, will never accept the concept of maintaining Ethiopia's territorial integrity. By virtue of the victories they won in recent battles, the Eritreans are in no mood to hold talks with the Ethiopian government. Similarly, the TPLF rejected the government's proposal last month. However, if the Rome meeting takes place, it might at least throw some light on a way out of the present impasse. Meanwhile, the government is organizing meetings in various regions in support of the Armed Forces. National committees are being formed in offices and factories to urge the public to join the Armed Forces. The war which has devastated the country continues.

Gambian Foreign Minister Exchanges Telegrams

LD2307191290 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 23 TASS—The Soviet and Gambian foreign ministers exchanged congratulatory telegrams on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries.

In their messages Eduard Shevardnadze and Omar Si confirmed a mutual desire to develop relations between the Soviet Union and Gambia in the interests of the two nations.

Kenyan Opposition Supports Multiparty System

EA2407212190 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 22 Jul 90

[By Vladimir Borisov from the "East Africa Last Week" program]

[Text] The situation in Kenya following the demonstrations which gripped the country was returning to normal last week, but the cause of the demonstrations, which resulted in deaths and injuries, has not been solved. The cause lay in the issue related to the establishment of a multiparty system in the country. It appears that this question will continue to dog the country and may cause new upheavels. The opposition calling for the abolition of the single-party system embraces prominent personalities who enjoy the support of broad sections of the society.

During the U.S. Congress debate on aid to Kenya, Senator Edward Kennedy tabled a bill calling on Washington not to support the Government of Kenya, whose security forces were suppressing people calling for democratic changes in the country. The bill will be put to the vote in September this year.

Niger Students Stage Sit-In at Embassy in Moscow

AB2407091090 Paris AFP in English 1503 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 23 (AFP)—Some 150 students from Niger staged a sit-in at their embassy here Monday for the second time in eight days, demanding Niamey pay overdue scholarships and give them plane tickets home.

Members of the Union of Niger Students and Trainees in the Soviet Union moved into the embassy with their luggage and vowed to remain there until their government paid allowances ranging from $85 to $120 apiece which they said were six months overdue.

They also wanted plane tickets back to Nigeria [as received] which they said they were entitled to once every two years.

Embassy officials promised to work out a solution after a similar protest last Monday, but failed to do so, the students said.

Niger's Ambassador Pierre Ausseil told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE his government's Finance Ministry was having trouble freeing up the funds but should be able work out the problem later in this week.

Somali Rebels Seize Soviet Trawler

LD2407144190 Moscow TASS in English 1425 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By LETA-TASS correspondent David Ghefter]

[Text] Riga July 24 LETA-TASS—Armed Somalian National Movement rebels seized a Soviet ocean-going freezer trawler, the Kaff, last Wednesday, its master reported in a radio message to the Riga-based association of the Western Basin's fisheries on Monday.

Georgiy Shipula's message ran as follows:

"The ship was catching fish in Somalian waters under a licence granted by the government of that country, when a launch came up to its board. Ten gunmen from the launch went to the trawler.

"Brandishing weapons, they forced the ship to go to an anchorage of the Island of Maid, near the Horn of Africa.

"Sixteen crew members and a Somalian inspector, who was on board, were taken ashore. Eleven leading specialists headed by the captain remained on the ship.

"According to the armed rebels, the main reason for the arrest was the license issued by the Somalian authorities

and the state flag of that country, which had been hoisted on the Soviet ship's mast in keeping with international rules."

Somali Leader Accused of Perpetuating Civil War

EA2507095290 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 22 Jul 90

[From the "East Africa Last Week" program]

[Text] Several important events took place in Somalia last week. Last Sunday, 15 July the regional security court released for lack of sufficient evidence people charged with disseminating the first Mogadishu manifesto. Prominent politicians in the country had accused the government of corruption and inability to end the civil war in the country. The manifesto, with 100 signatures, had called on the government to resign. The arrest of the 45 people last month had angered the masses. The heightened tension was symbolized by the disaster at the Mogadishu stadium, where President Barre was booed and made the target of stonethrowing resulting in the intervention of the Presidential Guard. In the ensuing chaos 60 people were killed and 200 wounded.

Subsequently, a decision by the president and the government was announced to the effect that in October 1990 a referendum would be held on the amendments applied to the constitution to be followed in February 1991 by elections to be contested by various parties. However, no new parties have been formed in the country so far.

South African Foreign Minister Interviewed

PM2007154290 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 29, 17-23 Jul 90 pp 20-22

[Interview with South African Foreign Minister R.F. Botha by Vitaliy Ignatenko and Nikolay Reshetnyak: "'We Have Crippled Ourselves by Apartheid...'"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Capetown, June—The minister invited us to his house for a cup of tea. At the doorway of his Capetown house we were welcomed by the hostess, Helena Botha, who took us into the reception room. There was a piano and a pile of copies of the music by Bach, Brahms and Chopin. Perhaps the whole family often gathers in this roon. We also saw many interesting books and ancient engravings. An "intellectual" house of business people. Mrs Botha treated us to the plum-cakes she had just baked. And, in general, she proved a very hospitable woman. Without joining our conversation, she was always beside, ready to help. Our conversation with the minister lasted several hours. We have chosen from it what seemed important to us.

[NEW TIMES] This is not your first interview with NEW TIMES. Our reports from Pretoria always meet with a most interested reaction from our readers. Yet change in contemporary South Africa is so speedy and ambiguous that new questions arise. For example: what dominates the political situation in South Africa today?

[Roelof Botha] In my view, our main accomplishment has been the formation of a clear-cut political spectrum, a polarization and definition of views in this country. We have the ruling National Party, the African National Congress—the chief opposition movement. The communist party, legal nowadays, which is led by Joe Slovo. These are followed by the Pan-African Congress of South Africa, Inkatha, the democratic and the conservative parties. Further on to the right from the conservative party you have the Afrikaner Resistance Movement. I should also mention the Labour Party, expressing the interests of coloured people, and the Solidarity party, formed by the Indians. Naming some of the main parties is nothing without giving some definition, saying whose interests they represent and what goals they are seeking. Let's start with the conservatives. Siding with the right-wing forces, they would like to see the continuation of apartheid, though, perhaps, in a harsher form. What they want is the revival of many old laws and traditions, racial segregation of people, etc. The ANC is campaigning for majority rule, for general elections that would be held according to the formula "one man one vote," in which case the winner coming out on top get everything. The Pan-African Congress pursues the policy of "black unity," fiercely opposes the idea of negotiations with the government, and is struggling for absolute rule with no power sharing. The Labour Party makes a point in its political platform of talking about social programmes, improving education, professional training and labour conditions. I think, Solidarity is a party seeking the introduction of democratic rights. The Democrats are more to the left of the spectrum than we the Nationals, yet on all major issues they come out in support of our policies and against the apartheid regime.

[NEW TIMES] Our Western colleagues are given to note that change in South Africa seems to be taking effect all of a sudden....

[Roelof Botha] Wrong. There is nothing unexpected. What has gained tremendous importance, in our view, in the eyes of the whole of Africa and indeed of the whole world are the recent developments in your country. Never before in the history of this country did anything happening so far away from home have such crucial significance to us. I believe, it was a wise move on Moscow's part to let the East European countries make their own choices. A few years ago this would have been unthinkable: I am sure the Army would have intervened and blocked any reform. I gatered from my meetings with heads of state of East European and Central European countries that they give credit to Mr. Gorbachev. More than once I have met with representatives of the newly-formed governments of those countries, and never have I felt any animosity or misapprehension on their part towards the Soviet Union. Rather, the opposite is the case, they are all telling me that they certainly welcome perestroyka in your country.

Gorbachev has done a great deal to open up the way for a full-blooded democratic process in your country, which is one reason why these developments have gained so much importance for us and for the whole of South Africa.

We keep a watchful eye on your foreign policies. You'll recall the decision to pull Soviet troops out of Afghanistan. All around the world, especially in America, people were very suspicious of this move, fearing that it was just another political manueuver that would never ever really mean a pull out. Yet I have always held that one can't ignore the simple fact that Mr. Gorbachev is a new brand of a political leader, one who has already carried out major reforms in his country. Even my colleagues—politicians from Germany and France—tried to convince me that the Kremlin leader had embarked on a wide-scale PR campaign to raise his profile. He needs, they reasoned, to strike certain political accords with the West, so he is trying to charm the world with his blandness and good manners, his friendliness and even his pretty wife. Yet the Russians, they continued, had a secret plan to follow, and all the change we were witnessing was a shortlived coverup. I have never believed a word of it. I had a feeling that something noteworthy, something outstanding should take place in the Soviet Union.

We now have a well-defined political reality of the Soviet Union's complete withdrawal from Afghanistan, and what is more, of the daily manifestations of its willingness to resolve peacefully all regional conflicts, including the South African issue. It was this dedication of Soviet politicans that allowed us to free Nelson Mandela and legalize the ANC and South African Community Party. I hope I've made it sufficiently clear why I think perestroika has had a decisive effect on internal events in South Africa.

After reform

[NEW TIMES] How do you think the situation in South Africa will develop after the first reforms take effect?

[Roelof Botha] There was a time when South African leaders believed an internal conflict could be settled by breaking South Africa into independent states, turning it thereby into a confederation of free territories.

It seemed that the moment the bantustans gained independence, everything would be OK. Life proved otherwise. The gap between the economies of different regions is far too wide, so we thought, if we can't solve our differences by dividing the state, we'd better agree to a single citizenship, equal opportunities and other elements that go along with a democratic society. And that was the path we chose....

[NEW TIMES] Do you believe that the processes currently taking place in South Africa are irreversible?

[Roelof Botha] There is no way you could turn around the situation now. A U-turn would mean political suicide. We are guided by one goal - carrying through the reform that has begun. President Frederik W. de Klerk was asked a similar question while visiting West Germany. He said: "Imagine a plane taking off and setting on course to its destination point. At a certain point in time it can no longer turn back for lack of fuel. The only thing to do is to fly on." It all started with Namibia when there was a lot of talk about it being a ruse, and that in reality we would never grant Namibia independence. Yet Namibia has gained independence! And the president and I were invited to the celebrations festivities. We met with heads of delegations from almost the entire world, and we did gain credibility. People began to trust our sincerity in relation to Namibia. It was a political milestone that buried suspicion. Yet we should bear in mind that freeing Namibia followed the release of Nelson Mandela and the legalization of peaceful demonstrations....

[NEW TIMES] Yet complete trust was still far down the road....

[Roelof Botha] Yes, major obstacles remained to be removed. Not all political prisoners had yet been let out of jail, and there were still a lot of political emigrees abroad. Protests continue in the predominantly black areas, the press is scathingly criticizing us for preserving the security forces that are used to suppress democratic movements. Naturally, we have heard calls to lift the state of emergency in the country. We, on our part, refuse to sit down at the negotiating table as long as some forces (not us!) encourage violence as a means of scoring political victories. To be brief, both the government of South Africa and the ANC still have problems blocking the progress of negotiations.

[NEW TIMES] You were part of the negotiating team when the first attempt was made to hold talks with the ANC. How do you describe the atmosphere of the talks?

[Roelof Botha] I would like, first of all, to make a mention of the fact that both sides displayed the utmost reserve.

Our meeting was, in fact, quite constructive. I guess, the ANC is facing (just as we are) the need for perestroika of a sort.... They should speed up the transformation process from an opposition force to a political party, win popular sympathy and explain to the people their views on the economy, agriculture, religion and the press. We understand all that takes time.

[NEW TIMES] No one could help noticing how in recent months your government has been galvanized into action on the international arena.

[Roelof Botha] Yes, both the president and I have never passed up a chance to raise the profile of this country abroad. We started with France. You know why? For many years, our relations with France remained cool.

Now French President Mitterrand has met with President de Klerk in the first visit of the South African leader to France since 1946. What followed was the first (since 1947) visit to Greece. And a visit to Spain was simply the very first in history. So what could the president say to the Europeans? First, that we have begun an irreversible process of reform. Second, that this country has undergone a renewal, it now has an entirely different set of priorities. We came to Europe not simply to ask for a lifting of sanctions against us. We sought an understanding of the fact that we were different: now you had to make your own choice what to do, was our message.

[NEW TIMES] Excuse me for bringing this up, but as far as I remember, the system of apartheid was fully operational at that time....

[Roelof Botha] So you say. In fact, only five old laws were still in force during the first official visit: the law on separate recreation facilities for whites and coloureds, the law on separate residence areas, according to which the city had been broken down into sections for whites, coloured, indians and blacks, the law on separate land use, which amounted to a village version of the previous law. (Say, a white man cannot buy land from a black one, and the other way around). Finally, the law on citizen registration. Certainly, one other thing is we still don't have a new constitution.

When in Europe, the president announced that the law on separate recreation facilities would be lifted in six weeks. Well, in six weeks, it was repealed. Indeed, it happened three weeks earlier. Now only the law on separate residence areas and separate land use remain. As soon as Parliament resumes work later this year, they will be abolished. But then it is easier said than done. Already now the black people are sending us requests for gurantees: yes, we want this law to be ablolished, they say. But if what you are going to do is buy out land in front of our small stores and build huge supermarkets there, that would kill our business. We want social guarantees. One other problem is that some of the black people would like to buy farms from whites, yet who could think of a white person buying land from a black person? In my government, we understand all these complexities, as well as the need for social protection. You may well know that practically all capital, and hence all economic strength, is in the hands of the white part of the population. Economically speaking, the blacks are a minority that needs protection.

Two other laws remain: a law on citizen registration, enforced in the run-up to general elections, which cannot be lifted as long as we go by the old constitution. Yet abolishing this constitution can only be done when a new one is ready. Negotiations with all the parties concerned should start soon on the drafting of a new constitution.

In conclusion, I would like to point out to you that our government has done all it could under the circumstances. Now everything is ready for the talks to start, now all parties have to sit down at the negotiating table and offer their own draft constitutions and its principles. Our party thinks it has a very steady footing. The economy is going strong, and we will be seeking a constitution guaranteeing free enterprise.

"We are Full of Hope..."

[NEW TIMES] Are you confused in any way over the obvious disparity between the pace of political reform in your country and economic realities?

[Roelof Botha] No, we are not. Not yet. Political realities in South Africa can be changed by abolishing apartheid laws, whereas in the economy, change is slower and far more difficult. To my mind, South Africa today is the "first" and "third world" all rolled into one.

[NEW TIMES] Don't you fear the time when South Africa can gradually transform itself from a country of racial conflicts into one of social conflicts? If, that is, you don't take care of the necessary reform measures. Consider, that in South Africa the rich are predominantly white and the blacks are generally poor and miserable....

[Roelof Botha] You are right.... Yet we are already taking certain steps to avoid such a possibility. Already we have introduced a law guaranteeing equal pay to all civil workers: a black teacher gets the same money as does a white one. The same goes for nurses and policemen, provided they have equal professional standards. By the way this is one of the reasons we are being criticized by the conservatives.

Yet by and large, you are quite right in that there is considerable lagging behind....

[NEW TIMES] How can you deal with this?

[Roelof Botha] We think this can be done by the introduction of a free- market economy. We want to open up this economy to the blacks, so to speak, so that they know what kind of system we offer them. How did things stand before? We have maimed, crippled ourselves with apartheid. The ideology of apartheid breeds division, enmity, hatred and conflicts. It has led us to a worldwide boycott. This isolation I hope is about to end now. The country now has a unique opportunity to use the momentum and work out a constitution, at long last enabling all citizens of South Africa to become partners.

One other observation I wanted to share with you concerns the puzzlement related to our visits abroad. We were taken aback at them. Wherever we went, we always felt that Europe had somehow lost all interest in our continent, had written us off. European business companies are leaving Africa because the African countries are running up tremendous debts and have very poor roads. Here governments are weak, yet prejudice rules supreme. There are goods but no ports to transport them to. Yet South Africa is a technologically developed country. Ten African states border on us, and together we number some 95 million people. Pooling efforts, we could form a strong trade and economic alliance. Our region has rich

natural resources, well-developed railways, a network of ports, aviation and communications, we have accumulated a great deal of experience in agriculture and medicine. We build roads and dams no worse than the Americans. As soon as apartheid is done away with and a new constitution is endorsed, the southern part of Africa could in my view in a way become a part of Europe....

We are full of hope....

Ugandan Government, Opposition Sign Accord

EA2407211790 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 22 Jul 90

[By Vladimir Borisov from the "East Africa Last Week]

[Text] In Uganda, says our correspondent, an important step has been taken toward national reconciliation. President Yoweri Museveni announced he has pardoned the former secretary general of the Democratic Party, who was also the commander of the party's military wing [as heard], Francis Bwengye. Bwengye returned to Kampala from London on 15 July after 10 years in exile. He resigned his post in the movement and condemned rebellion. He was accompanied to Kampala by two functionaries of the Sudan-based Blessed October Movement. [as heard] According to Uganda Government reports, the chairman of the organization is the former dictator of Uganda, Milton Obote.

Thus it appears that the national reconciliation policy of the National Resistance Movement led by Yoweri Museveni is already bearing fruit. This is also indicated by the fact that the government has signed a peace accord with the Uganda [People's] Democratic Movement. If the present trend continues, it will be possible to say that the peace so long desired by the people of Uganda is in reach.

East Europe

Gerasimov Holds News Conference in Czechoslovakia

LD2407195390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Gerasimov, collegium member and chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, who is in Prague, held a news conference today for Czechoslovak and foreign journalists. He covered the main directions of the Soviet Union's foreign policy and answered numerous questions from journalists.

Describing relations between the USSR and the CSFR, Comrade Gerasimov stressed that they are developing normally, proceeding from the new situation of mutual interest. The Soviet guest was received by Dienstbier, deputy chairman of the government and CSFR foreign minister.

CSFR Reportage on Visit

WA2507111690

For Czechoslovak media reportage on the visit by USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov to Czechoslovakia, including reports on his news conference in which he expresses views on NATO and a united Germany, please see the Czechoslovakia section of the 25 July East Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Foreign Trade Minister Begins Moscow Talks

LD2407225190 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1930 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Soviet Union—Slavomir Stracar, Czechoslovak minister of foreign trade began talks in Moscow today with his sector colleague Konstantin Katushev. As our minister stated, the main area of questions are conditions of trade exchange for next year, the gradual transition to accounts in freely convertible currency, and solving problems in the fulfilment of this year's agreed deliveries which concerns deliveries in Soviet crude oil in particular.

Costs of Troop Withdrawal From GDR Assessed

PM2307144490 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 90 p 2

[Article by special correspondent A. Krayniy: "Crazy Marks Are What Our Troops Need To Leave Germany. And Absolutely Insane Marks To Stay"]

[Text] June was feverish, overheated. Rumors, each more far-fetched than the last, spread through the garrisons, all of them about money. Will the marks accumulated through rigorous savings be exchanged, and if so, how: one to one? one to two? one to three?

Men on leave stormed the cash offices in the attempt to buy a ticket for Eastern marks in good time, while officers' wives broke their backs in the German strawberry fields. Two years ago, German farmers were paying 1.5 marks for each basket of strawberries picked, one year ago—one mark, and now—70 pfennigs. The pay has fallen, yet the farmers were confronted by waiting lines: "Take me!"

It was only a matter of days until monetary union between the two Germanies, but nothing was clear either to the ordinary people or to the leadership of the Western Group of Forces. The Western mark is not the same as the Eastern, it is hard currency, but where can you get it, and in what quantities?

No doubt the government in the Kremlin was also racking its brains during those days. There were not many options—in fact, given our currency deficit, there were only two: either a loan from the West, a loan which, first, would be short-term, because in present times the capitalists will not venture on a long-term loan, and, second, a loan which you know beforehand will be

another stone hanging around our overstrained necks, money with which we will not buy equipment, or technology, or even consumer goods—the group of forces will simply eat it up, literally. And the second option: oil and gas. In view of our strained situation with gasoline, fuel oil, solar oil, and so forth, this is not very tempting either.

The presence of Soviet troops in the GDR is changing with every passing day from a political problem to an economic problem. And when it was calculated how much money it will cost to maintain the group, it became clear: We will leave Germany, we will simply be pushed out like the cork from a bottle of frothing champagne.

In the Western newspapers, a figure was quoted: By the end of this year the Soviet troops in Germany will cost our state 1.2 billion marks. That is for six months. But the withdrawal of troops, a systematic withdrawal, rather than a chaotic retreat to the homeland as is happening with the troops leaving Hungary and the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic], will take around five years, according to the calculations of Rainer Eppelmann, GDR minister of disarmament and defense. So work it out.

But 1.2 billion is a Western estimate. What is ours?

"I cannot tell you the exact figure," Major General Sergey Sergeyevich Kondrashov, chief of a directorate at the USSR Defense Ministry Central Financial Directorate, told me. "I know it, but it is not for the open press. Let us put it like this: The calculation runs to hundreds of millions of marks. And the government has found that money."

It has indeed found the money, and it was not far off. I discovered that the currency was obtained from oil and gas deliveries: They chose not, perhaps, the lesser of the two evils, but the more long-term, the more remote in terms of time.

On sober reflection, the government should not be berated just because there was no way out. There are situations in which, whatever you do, things are bad. The mistake was made earlier, when we (not you and I, reader, but those who create foreign policy) failed to reckon with the coming changes in Eastern Europe. Having started the peaceful revolution, perestroyka, we probably never imagined that the flame of that revolution would sweep through half a continent. It became clear that there was no need even to export this revolution, since the ideas of perestroyka proved so attractive to peoples laboring under the yoke of totalitarianism.

It has now become a commonplace to say that the peoples of Eastern Europe proved more radical than us in the desire for changes, and went further. I do not know whether it is because they had been living in the system designed by us for only half as long and had not forgotten what democracy and freedom are, or for some other reasons, but that is not the point. The point at issue is the situation we find ourselves in, we, the "elder brother," who asserted by fire and the sword the advantages of feudal socialism.

Their laudable radicalism has led to a situation where the problems of Soviet troops being withdrawn from Eastern Europe are now being added to all our numerous domestic difficulties.

For instance, we have to leave Czechoslovakia in 16 months, and Hungary in 15 and a half. "We" means more than 120,000 servicemen and about 100,000 members of the warrant officers' and officers' families. I have mentioned previously that in principle everything the soldiers need (barracks, cafeterias, bathhouses, and so forth) exists. True, the soldiers will be sleeping on bunk beds, which is not very good, but is perfectly tolerable, after all, a soldier only has to put up with inconveniences for 720 days [two years' service]. But what about the officer and his wife and child?

As of today the demand for apartments for troops being withdrawn from Eastern Europe is vast. Some 25,000 are needed. That is only apartments, and on top of that there are kindergartens, creches, schools.

It was noted at a recent session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security that the problem of settling servicemen's families arriving from Eastern Europe has become (has already become, although by no means all the units have arrived in the Union as yet) tremendously acute. In all the districts where the people's deputies went to study the state of affairs, the picture is the same: shortfalls in deliveries of construction materials to the Defense Ministry, refusals by oblast and city soviet executive committees to allow military men to participate on a proportional basis in the construction of housing for officers' and warrant officers' families, nonfulfillment by the majority of local soviets of the government decision on allocating housing to men discharged from service (the soviets are already in debt to the tune of an astronomical number of apartments, and I am afraid even this debt will not be paid off—their own waiting lines of voters and indigenous inhabitants are giving them no peace, and as for the military.... What about the military? They will manage somehow—that is apparently how they reason in the local organs of power). Everyone has their own problems, and we can understand them all. Belorussia has its own tragedy, Chernobyl. The Baltic region—"they did not consult with us when they took the decision." The Council of Ministers—"here's 70 million," but all these millions are only on paper, there are no construction materials to back them up. Added to all this is the most recent problem—in the spring draft, which was basically wrecked, the military construction detachments received one young recruit to take the place of every two men discharged to the reserves. So even if you had the bricks, who would do the building?

They are building, of course. True, they are building mainly prefabricated paneling blocks where it is

planned, in the language of the documents, to "allocate one room per family with communal kitchens and separate toilets." Not the most pleasing of prospects, wouldn't you say?

But looking at the situation from the outside, you do not know what you yourself would think if you were in the place of those who now have to get out of the mess that joint efforts got them into. On the one hand, it is crazy to spend many millions on building temporary accommodation, and then build again, on a permanent basis. On the other, winter is on the way, you simply cannot hurry in building five-story apartment blocks, and how can you leave people on the streets?

This desperate problem could be lessened, alleviated, if.... Perhaps what I am going to say will offend some people's ears, and this expression is, no doubt, not very politically sophisticated, but: To put it bluntly, our departure from Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia should have been sold. At the highest possible price. Both the departure and what we are leaving behind. Without going into detail, let me observe that the mechanism for the sale of material and domestic assets, which amount to just over 4 billion rubles in the two groups of forces, was not worked out in good time, and now the governments of both Hungary and the CSFR are inclined to favor the "zero option," that is, our claims on them cancel out their claims on us: the ecological damage done by the Soviet troops, plus the debts of our country (not the military's debts) to those countries.

Everyone remembers when and in what circumstances our divisions arrived in Prague and Budapest. We do not have a leg to stand on, as the saying goes. But Germany is a different matter!

We arrived there in 1945, and we arrived fighting. The Western Group of Forces, of all our four groups, is a special case. On its own. It is poor, in terms of the living conditions and standard of living (compared with the German standard of living) of the officers and warrant officers. It is costly, if you reckon up how much it has cost, and is still costing, the Soviet taxpayer. It is one of a kind. It is favored—there is no 1956 or 1968 in its history.

But here too, in the Western Group, it looks as if the same situation is about to repeat itself.

"The 1957 treaty governing the conditions of our troops' presence in the GDR basically nullifies the Potsdam agreements," I was told by an agitated Maj. Gen. Sergey Pavlovich Kharebin, first deputy chief of the group's rear services, who, at the time of our conversation, was acting chief. "We have looked into it, and it seems that without the permission of the owner of the land on which our structures are located, we cannot sell anything. I proposed to the mixed Soviet-German commission that the following formula be adopted: The owner of the land has a priority right of purchase, but not an exclusive right. Or else what will happen?! Perhaps he will deliberately not buy, so that we have to abandon everything for nothing? In the postwar period we have built 215 stores, apart from anything else, on the territory of the military camps. And what about the camps themselves? And the fuel dumps and the overpasses? And the training centers? And the fact that we rebuilt all the airfields?"

It would not be true to say that nothing is being done, that we are observing dispassionately the developing situation in Germany. Specialists have arrived at the Western Group from the Council of Ministers, the State Planning Committee, and the Defense Ministry, and joint working parties have been set up in which we and the Germans are trying to reach an amicable agreement. The trouble is that those sent from the Union and those who are working on the joint working parties, with all due respect, are not even third-rankers in their departments, they are staffers, not decision-makers.

Yet what is needed is a political decision, at the level of our countries' leadership.

I do not know what that decision will be. But I know one thing for sure: In all the postwar years we did not get anything free in Germany. What was needed for life and for service was partly brought in from the Union, but much was bought here. From vegetables to construction materials.

And when you close your eyes and review mentally all our numerous garrisons in the GDR, complicated feelings grip you. You understand the impatience of the Germans, the majority of whom are willing to send us off with flowers tomorrow: Two generations have grown up since the war, seeing from their earliest childhood Soviet—which means, foreign—soldiers at the threshold of their own homes. But then again, you share the feelings of the front-line soldiers, their perplexity and confusion. Thirdly, in human terms it seems a pity simply to abandon, for nothing at all, everything that was built over the long years. Fourthly.... Fourthly, I think with anxiety of the fact that the Western Group of Forces is not the same thing as the Central (CSFR) or the Southern (Hungary). I am not giving away any secrets by saying that there are considerably more of our officers and men in Germany, and if an influx of people without apartments floods into our Motherland from there too, even a huge country like ours will not be able to absorb it.

It is easy, as they say, for outsiders to give advice—they are not responsible. But all the same, I will risk it. This problem, after all, does not only affect the politicians, it is our common problem.

It seems to me that all the property disputes and unclear issues must be resolved—by setting up an intergovernmental commission—with the German side right now, today, while our combat units are still in Germany. As the experience of the CSFR and Hungary shows, it is all but useless to try to talk about it after the event. The option "first you withdraw all the troops, and then we will decide" is also unacceptable because the military

camps left behind by our units promptly become no one's business, and the pilfering begins.

I also think that if an agreement is reached with the German side, it is not money we need now—it is houses, schools, kindergartens. Clearly there is some point in setting up a detailed program for the withdrawal of troops from the GDR making provision for the possibility of compensatory construction of residential camps on our territory by the German side with German money, or else deliveries of prefabricated housing which we ourselves will assemble somehow. All this is perfectly possible, in view of the fact that there are several fairly large house-building combines on the territory of what is now the GDR which will not stand up to the fierce Western competition and will inevitably be either closed or radically modernized. Our order would provide an opportunity to carry out the modernization (both material and social) in the most painless way.

Excuse my using gambling terminology, but according to my reasoning, in this situation we have only one trump card—our consent to a united Germany's joining NATO. In exchange for this consent we could both resolve the problem of the Western Group of Forces and obtain new credits. There is no need to raise indignant eyebrows—the world has changed, and we may as well get used to the idea. The North Atlantic alliance has markedly "warmed" toward us, and the "two-plus-four" conferences, that is, the two Germanies plus the victorious countries, could, if we continue to be inflexible as we were yesterday and before, turn into "five-minus-one" conferences. In my opinion the country has spent long enough sitting in a trench with enemies on all sides; let us make our way out of this trench. I am not saying that we should just stick our bayonets in the ground, that is not the point. It is time to stop looking at the world through the safety glass of a tank. Paradoxically, this does not apply to the government, which has already stopped doing that; it applies to you and me, reader. Judging by the mail the newspaper receives, it is you and I who are failing to clamber out of the trench. And those who are comfortable in the trench.

...But we will leave Germany. Not today, but we will. In five years or so, it seems, of all the many thousands of men of the Western Group of Forces—that poor, costly, favored, one and only group—only one Soviet soldier will be left in Germany. A stone soldier. In Treptow Park. And I would not take him away. Let the Germans keep him. As a memento.

GDR Embassy Adopts Edict on Asylum for Jews

LD2407165190 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—The IZVESTIYA newspaper publishes today a statement by the Embassy of the German Democratic Republic in Moscow. The statement says: "The Government of the German Democratic Republic is aware of its historic responsibility to citizens of the Jewish nationality. For this reason, in view of the adoption of new legal regulations concerning the stay of foreign citizens in the GDR and giving asylum to foreigners, an additional regulation was adopted for citizens of the Jewish nationality, who are subjected to discrimination or are persecuted.

"Under this regulation, foreign citizens of the Jewish nationality may be granted the right to stay in the GDR on humanitarian grounds. However, this is possible only for a limited number of people and is related to the applicant's ability to prove the existence of the listed prerequisites. The specific possibility of reception and the provision of lodgings in the GDR should be taken into account in each separate case."

FRG, GDR Reactions to Kohl Visit Contrasted

LD1907211190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 19 July broadcasts a two-minute report by correspondent Aleksandr Zubenko from Berlin on GDR and FRG press reaction to FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl's visit to the USSR. Zubenko points out that previous attitudes have been reversed, with the FRG Press now writing with rapture about the Soviet - West German summit, whereas the tone of the mass media in the GDR is more restrained. The reaction of the GDR population to that summit is by no means unequivocal, he says with some Social Democrats, for instance, believing that the accords have weakened the Social Democratic Party's position and have considerably lessened that party's chances in the forthcoming elections. At the same time, the right-wing flank of the political arena in the GDR and West Germany has been strengthened. GDR Foreign Minister Markus Meckel, despite the situation which is emerging, has spoken out in favor of retaining the GDR's independent army on the Republic's present territory.

Hungary Demands Condemnation of 1956 Events

LD2407110190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] The Hungarian parliament has called for the official and unequivocal condemnation by the USSR Supreme Soviet of the sending of Soviet troops to Hungary in 1956. Describing that event as a serious crime against the Hungarian people, the deputies of Hungary's supreme legislative body said the Soviet parliament should adopt a special statement qualifying the 1956 actions as illegal intervention.

The Hungarian MPs also point to a precedent, when earlier this year the Soviet Union recognized as wrong the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia by the troops of a number of Warsaw Pact countries.

West Europe

3 Red Army Soldiers Seek Asylum in FRG

LD2407165490 Hamburg DPA in German 1515 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Bonn/Hanover (DPA)—Three members of the Red Army stationed in the GDR have made use of the freedom of movement across the intra-German border to escape to the Federal Republic. The Lower Saxony Interior Ministry confirmed today that last Thursday [19 July] a soldier escaped across what is now an open border from his base in Hasselfelde (GDR) to Hohegeiss in the Upper Harz. The man, who did not make an application for asylum, has been taken to the prison at Wolfenbuettel. He has been ordered to be detained awaiting deportation.

Two other members of the Soviet troops in the GDR reported to the Bad Lauterberg police station. They, too, left their base on Thursday and crossed the border to the FRG on Saturday. Both applied for asylum and were assigned to the Lower Saxony central authority for resettlers.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Army has been searching for the deserters in the Upper Harz. Under the law, entry into West German territory is only permitted to members of the Soviet military mission stationed in the Federal Republic following prior announcement. The supposition that this case could lead to diplomatic complications between the FRG and the Soviet Union was played down by the Foreign Ministry in Bonn. This situation, which has arisen for the first time since the political changes in Eastern Europe, calls for a discussion of the principles involved, it was said in Bonn.

Abalkin Arrives in FRG for Economics Talks

LD2407205890 Moscow TASS in English 2043 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text] Bonn July 24 TASS—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin, who arrived in West Germany on a working visit today, met Lutz Stavenhagen, minister of state in the federal chancellor's office.

During the talk they discussed in detail the development of bilateral relations and mutually beneficial cooperation, primarily in the economy.

They beleive that the recent meeting between West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev provided an important impetus to extending and deepening them.

Stavenhagen told TASS that the exchange of views was very important and useful for both sides. He said West Germans got an opportunity to acquaint themselves in detail with the plan of transformations in the USSR, which can be evaluated as a gradual transition to a regulated market economy. He said this was an ambitious and bold programme, which, from West Germany's point of view, was quite feasible, however.

Stavenghagen said the Federal Government intended to give all- around support in implementing drastic economic reforms in the Soviet Union. He said concentrated efforts by all member-countries of the European Community and other major Western states were needed to ensure the success of perestroyka. West Germany is ready to take upon itself the role of a coordinator and connecting link.

"We know that there are sceptics among Western representatives, calling to postpone specific aid to the Soviet Union until the clear outlines of the economic reform emerge. We oppose the wait-and-see stance. Timely aid is the best kind of assistance." Stavenhagen stressed.

On the same day, Abalkin met West German Economics Minister Helmut Haussmann. Their talk focused on all key issues of Soviet- West German economic cooperation. The sides reaffirmed their readiness to deepen bilateral relations with account of accords reached at the recent Soviet-West German summit.

Abalkin spoke highly of the West German stance on aid to the Soviet Union at the latest conferences of the heads of Western states in Dublin and Houston.

Much attention at the talk was paid to trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and a future united Germany. Abalkin pointed to the need to preserve traditional ties between Soviet enterprises and their partners on the territory of the present German Democratic Republic, which was received with understanding by West German representatives.

The talk also focused on prospects for implementing several major joint projects in the USSR in the light of its current economic reforms. In the sides' view, the programme to convert defense sectors to civilian work opens favourable opportunities for qualitatively upgrading bilateral ties and boosting the supply of high-tech goods to the West German and European markets.

The sides also considered assistance by West German experts in carrying out economic transformations at different levels—from republics to a separate enterprise—and the training of Soviet economic managers in West Germany.

Soviet Hijacker To Be Extradited From Finland

LD2407140790 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1300 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Aircraft hijacker Oleg Kozlov will be returned from Finland to the Soviet Union, Justice Minister Tarja Halonen has announced.

[Begin Halonen recording] After taking into consideration the statement by the Supreme Court and the views

expressed in it, the Justice Ministry has decided that Kozlov, who is suspected of hijacking an aircraft, will be returned to the USSR. [end recording]

The extradition decision was announced at a news conference which just ended at the Banquet Hall of the Council of State. Esa Tuominen continues.

[Tuominen] At the beginning of the news conference the Interior Minister Jarmo Rantanen announced that he had rejected the application for asylum of Soviet aircraft hijacker Oleg Kozlov. His application was already the second of its kind. Rantanen provided few details and limited explanations of his decision. Rantanen just noted that Kozlov has not been subjected to persecution in the Soviet Union because of his political views.

Justice Minister Tarja Halonen, for her part, announced that she had decided that Kozlov will be returned to the Soviet Union. Her decision took into account the earlier decision by the Supreme Court that there are no hindrances to the return. A condition for the extradition included in Justice Minister Halonen's decision caused quite a lot of confusion at the news conference. According to the condition, Kozlov is not to be prosecuted in the Soviet Union without permission from the Finnish Ministry of Justice for any other crime committed before his repatriation. The minister of justice failed to explain how this condition will be implemented and what exactly this condition means. In addition, Minister Halonen's decision includes a request that information be provided by the Soviet Union about how Kozlov's case is progressing in court.

The lawyer for the Soviet hijacker, Markku Fredman, has announced that he will ask the European Human Rights Commission to intervene in the case. According to him, the implementation of the agreement between Finland and the Soviet Union on returning hijackers is in conflict with the European human rights agreement.

Justice Minister Tarja Halonen announced that the case of the other hijacker, Mikhail Varfolomeyev, will be ruled on in the next few days. She emphasized that these two cases are separate and they will be dealt with completely separately.

French Premier Says USSR Needs Support

PM2407091790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "French Prime Minister's View of Perestroyka"]

[Text] Tokyo, 20 Jul—The CPSU Congress clearly demonstrated that a separation of state and party structures is taking place in the Soviet Union, French Prime Minister Michel Rocard said at a news conference here today.

He is in Japan on an official visit. The Western countries' policy vis-a-vis the USSR was an important theme of his talks with Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and other members of the Japanese Government.

Assessing the situation in the USSR, M. Rocard expressed the view that the development of events in the country has gone considerably further than the original plans of M.S. Gorbachev and his entourage. He drew attention to the rapid advance of political reforms aimed at ensuring freedom in the Soviet Union. The multiparty system has been acknowledged and free elections are being held. At the same time, the French government head noted that the fundamental economic transformations are lagging behind the political reforms and the mechanism for reforms in the economy has not yet been finally elaborated.

The situation is extremely acute in the USSR at the moment, M. Rocard said. We do not want internal problems in the Soviet Union to get even worse, of course. Therefore, the Western countries, the prime minister of France—which was one of the most vigorous advocates of assistance for the USSR at the recent Houston conference of leaders of the seven major industrially developed powers—noted, must consider how to support the Soviet Union. M. Rocard noted that the debate about what form the contribution to improving the situation in the USSR should take is not yet over. This problem requires an urgent solution, he stressed.

Communist Party's Falin Meets FRG Businessman

LD2407170790 Moscow TASS in English 1637 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Valentin Falin today met visiting president of the group of Hoelter firms Heinz Hoelter. The talk focused on cooperation in the interests of environmental protection.

Maltese Diplomats Received at Foreign Ministry

LD2407173190 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitinsky today received visiting Maltese foreign minister adviser I. Saliba and Foreign Ministry department head R. Lapira.

They discussed current international problems and the role of neutral and non-aligned countries in the all-European process and ensuring security and cooperation in the Mediterranean. They also discussed Soviet-Maltese relations.

Saliba invited a group of Soviet children who suffered from the Chernobyl disaster to visit Malta during their holidays.

The meeting was attended by Maltese Ambassador to the Soviet Union Maurice Lubrano.

Swedish Government Appealed To Retain Hijacker

PM2007145390 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 19 Jul 90 p 5

[Report by Dag Eklund: "Ukraine Appeals on Behalf of Hijacker"]

[Excerpt] "Make an exception and don't hand over Anatoliy Mikhaylenko to the Soviet authorities. He is threatened with the death penalty."

This is the appeal made by around 15 Ukrainian parliamentarians in a letter to the Swedish Government.

In the letter, the politicians condemn the hijacking perpetrated by Anatoliy Mikhaylenko but they also appeal for understanding. They write: "The reason for the hijacking was the fear of conscription into the Soviet Army. Bullying, violence, and sadism, often linked to drug abuse, are rife in the Army."

They also write: "Ukrainian conscripts are sent into areas of conflict to counter the unrest there. They are forced to shoot at innocent people or are themselves seen as occupiers and become victims." [passage omitted]

Chaplin, Turkish Envoy Discuss Bilateral Ties

LD2407115190 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Boris Chaplin received Turkey's ambassador to the Soviet Union Volkan Vural at the latter's request to discuss bilateral relations, including consular cooperation.

United Kingdom's Policy on Cambodia Examined

LD2107130190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Commentary by Aleksandr Malikov, "special correspondent in London," on Britain's policy on Cambodia]

[Text] London's policy toward Cambodia has all these years reminded one of exhausted running behind the leader by a long-distance runner, who only expects that he will be allowed to last the distance. Now that Washington has apparently decided that it is time to dissociate itself from the bloody supporters of Pol Pot, British policy may also finally emerge from a vicious closed circle.

Last autumn it seemed that matters were really proceeding in this direction. The government at the time—one must say—particularly felt the pressure of public opinion after the television broadcast of John Pilger's documentary film about renewed atrocities by Pol Pot's people in Cambodia. Against this background; Britain's diplomatic support at the United Nations for the coalition which includes the Khmer Rouge began to look even more odious.

Now it seems that Pol Pot's people may be deprived of another of its longstanding protectors. Addressing members of Parliament, Lord Brabazon, minister of state at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, has welcomed the U.S. wish to enter into a dialogue with Vietnam. He also reiterated the idea that Britain should review its position on the issue of the seat at the United Nations of the legitimate representative of Cambodia, which would mean—I think—not only de jure renunciation but also de facto renunciation of support for Pol Pot's followers.

28th CPSU Congress

Gorbachev's Congress Performance Assessed

90UN2394B Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 28, 14 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by T. Yakhlakova: "Mikhail Gorbachev"]

[Text] For its entire almost century-old history the party never had a real leader. If you do not consider the founder of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party. However, having evolved long ago from a political organization into a state power structure, the CPSU did not need leaders at all. It needed leaders who were bearers of authority and not of ideas. And it was necessary to begin the movement backward—from state structure to political organization—in order to awaken the need for both new ideas and leaders.

The year 1985 gave the country a leader, but not yet of the party, although Gorbachev came onto the stage of political life as the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Our previous general secretaries were so faceless that the feeling of a lively person in the first months sent one into euphoria. In the process no one was amazed by the quickly appearing (and it must be admitted, equally as quickly disappearing) sugary portraits from which a carefully touched-up face gazed out.

But the wife? It turns out that the general secretary can have a wife... This fact alone seemed amazing, and I remember well how Lithuania and Belorussia with similar ardor were showing that Raisa Maksimovna was by origin from their home towns. A little later other regions also joined this debate...

The radiant times of universal friendliness for Gorbachev, alas, ended quickly. Today, no one any longer remembers the real delight over the fact that Gorbachev spoke without notes, and the ranks of those who mimic his voice and manners is multiplying. That is the way it should be, but it is not bad to remember in so doing that politics in our country began to acquire "faces of uncommon expression" starting precisely with Gorbachev.

The country moved with difficulty to presidential rule, and the first deputy congress was a negation of everything that was not established in the old-fashioned understanding of socialism [sentence as published]. A lot of advisers appeared at Gorbachev's side, but inasmuch as he did not listen to everyone's advice by far, still more opponents then appeared who gradually turned into enemies. But he was and remains the indisputable leader of the country.

But the matter was more complicated with the party. The position of general secretary is an authoritative one, but it is not completely a leadership position, and we have long since understood (more properly—not very long ago) that a lot of power must not be placed in one pair of hands. And at first, Gorbachev was asked to leave this post, and after that they began to threaten with popular anger.

And then, at that moment, the party finally acquired a leader in the person of Gorbachev. The 28th CPSU Congress, which with a great degree of probability promised him defeat (and the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] only reinforced this probability), ended with an unquestionable victory for Gorbachev. He thinks that the party, which still possesses real authority, cannot be turned over to conservative forces. And for that reason, together with his own team, he once more demonstrated a brilliant ability at the congress to manage any audience, even a very aggressive one. But, nevertheless, the victory at the congress—now that a stratification of opinions and positions has begun in the party—is not simply a victory of personality. It is the victory of the centrist idea (for the time being only ideas), which is present even in the most polarized society as a kind of self-preservation instinct.

The paradoxical nature of today's situation is that, having become the general secretary, Gorbachev, a convinced supporter and advocate of consolidation, is inevitably losing part of the party. Some do not forgive him for "holding more than one office," and others, for a stubborn reluctance to openly and unambiguously join the right or the left wing, and the third, for the "exodus" from the CPSU, which is perceived as a dissolution of the party.

It is naive to suppose that Gorbachev did not foresee such a course of events. I think that he knew this back when he was skillfully blocking the idea of convening the 28th CPSU Congress ahead of schedule: In order to avoid the errors of the forces that were dispersing, it was necessary to create such conditions in the country that politically active groups could legalize their activity, without entering into conflict either with the law or with public opinion. Today such conditions have been established, and for that reason it seems to me that the stormy and certainly accusatory reaction to the Leningrad Initiative Congress or the Russian Constituent Congress is somewhat outdated. Why should there not be such parties—no one today is roping anyone in. And why is it necessary to demand the self-dissolution of the CPSU, when one can leave it if one chooses to?

An 18 million-member party cannot dissolve itself. And to call for this is either a hair-brained scheme or political infantilism. Even a self-dissolution proclaimed by special decree will denote only one thing: It is the centrist forces that will leave, but the conservatives and the radicals, who united in their own parties, will bang heads either over sharing of property or over ideological irreconcilability. Gorbachev is attempting to establish a party of a Leninist persuasion not from scratch, which would require many years, but by relying on the centrist forces inside the CPSU, utilizing its structure and leaving doors open both for those entering and for those leaving. It

would do no harm to stop laying down ultimatums to him, to find out whom he is with, and to learn how to cooperate with him, and not try to turn him to one's own belief.

If Gorbachev succeeds in transforming the CPSU into a strong centrist party, equal in rights with other political forces, which has been practically done de jure, the processes of democratization will really become irreversible. But the dramatics of the situation consists of the fact that his own dedication to the communist idea and the people's increasing doubts in the idea, to whom it is absolutely unimportant whether the classics of Marxism-Leninism led to this life of ours or whether we ourselves succeeded in this matter, can end up in an unresolvable conflict. Of course, Gorbachev is a realist, and his communist conviction is tolerant.

He showed this toleration once again at the congress, when B.N. Yeltsin, who is given to outward effect, announced his leaving the CPSU to the whole country.

Gorbachev reacted to this much more calmly than did the audience.

That is why he is the right person in the right place today.

Congress Resolution on Response to Letters

PM2407140790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[28th CPSU Congress Resolution "On Letters From Working People Addressed to the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] [The 28th CPSU Congreess resolves:]

1. To take note of the Congress Secretariat report on letters from communists and non-party people addressed to the 28th CPSU Congress and on the organization of work to examine them.

2. To instruct the party Central Committee and the CPSU Central Control Commission to complete their work with letters addressed to the 28th CPSU Congress and to take measures to ensure the careful, timely examination of the questions, proposals, observations, and requests contained in them connected with eliminating shortcomings and other sources of justified criticism and complaint from citizens.

The results of the work done on examining letters from working people addressed to the 28th CPSU Congress are to be reported in the central party press.

Congress Delegates View Leaders' Reports

90UN2294A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jul 90 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Article by V. Izgarshev, A. Petrushov, I. Podsvirov, L. Pyatiletova, and V. Khatuntsev published under the rubric "28th CPSU Congress": "Congress Chronicle, the Second Day: Special PRAVDA Correspondents Report From the Kremlin"]

[Text] The personal reports from individuals who are part of the higher political leadership are an undoubtedly democratic phenomenon that characterizes the changes in the party. During the report and election campaign, both in local meetings and in higher-level conferences the question of the reports by CPSU leaders was raised repeatedly. Such is the will of the party masses who can no longer be satisfied with the anonymity of various people making decisions from above and who want to know which concrete steps and actions mark the contribution to perestroyka from members of the leadership, as well as their attitude toward problems of sociopolitical renewal in society.

Let us recall that on the eve of the congress PRAVDA published an interview with members and candidate members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee. So both the printed word and the word from the podium of the party forum should have given a fairly complete idea not only of, as they say, the personal contribution of each individual but also the activity of the commissions of the CPSU Central Committee they head as well as departments such as the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the KGB, and the Ministry of Defense. And if a person had a foretaste of the "confessions on a given theme," he might be disenchanted. An analysis of the changes in the past five years of perestroyka and the problems that have arisen during the course of it can by no means be reduced to the personal factor, although, of course, the imprint of the subjective somehow makes its way into any matter.

Both from the reaction in the hall and from the responses of the delegates it could be noted that the attention was held by those people reporting who managed in their prepared speeches to correlate the size of the problems with self-expression of the individual understanding of perestroyka processes, the changes in the party, and the hopes and aspirations of the people. In our times, which are saturated with parliamentary debates and impassioned speeches at rallies, such an oratorical genre as a report on one's own work is not well received by the public.

And what is the attitude of the congress delegates to the reports they heard?

The first to have the floor in the morning meeting was Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov. He worked on the "defense sector" in the Politburo. Until recently this sector of party work was essentially completely concealed from the heads of our people. Now in the days of glasnost much has become public here and people can judge for themselves what is being produced by the new political thinking on the basis of which a unilateral reduction of armed forces is being carried out and conversion is taking place.

We will be speaking with one of the "defense workers"—secretary of the party committee of the Kharkov Radiorele Association, P. Kudinov.

"Our collective has been working exclusively on orders from the Defense Ministry and from a number of branches of the Defense Ministry. For the second year now we are increasing the output of consumer goods. It might seem to some people that our goods have too limited a range of application—sockets, switches, relays. But it is impossible to do without them either in the home or in production. If we add to this the fact that in our country, as a rule, any production is a monopoly, one can begin to understand how important the organization of the output of this kind of product is for us.

"And I will say frankly that it is advantageous for us. The volume of output is essentially unlimited: for the number of our competitors can be counted on the fingers of one hand. But the consumer needs more than just sockets and switches. After all, we are capable of producing computers as well. But where would we get the microprocessors? And here the matter rests on the statewide conversion program. As we know, it does not actually exist yet; it is still in the stage of planning and development. And judging from the assurances of responsible comrades, we cannot expect it before autumn.

"Last year we collected 2,000 electric water heaters. This is an indispensable piece of equipment for the rural resident or the owner of a garden plot. This year we will produce 6,000 of these sets of equipment. But this is just a drop in the bucket.

"Or there is such an instrument as a protective device—a kind of automatic guard. It is for the apartment, the house, and the car, especially taking into account the current crime situation in the country.

"But in our plans they have included the production of medical equipment and other electrical equipment that is in short supply. And here it is clear that the program is needed because unless we balance the deliveries of batching items the plans could remain on paper."

"Has conversion not had a negative effect on the wages of the workers? Some people are complaining about this."

"Certainly not," answers Pavel Panteleyevich. "Wages have increased and this is the result of increasing the output of consumer goods. The increase amounted to 180 percent. And it has not stopped here. And this will enable us to build more of our own housing and improve social and domestic services for workers of the association. This is our party concern.

"There are 400 defense plants and 100 enterprises of civilian ministries engaged in the output of military products that are 'falling under' conversion. At all of them things should be the way they are at the Kharkov association. But, alas, there are enterprises where instead of the previous products, which were produced on the basis of complicated modern technologies, they hastened to begin stamping out plates for public catering. Would it not be more reasonable, say, for military aircraft builders to produce from their shops not plates but aircraft for Aeroflot—after all, the demand for them is extremely great. All one has to do is look at any of the four Moscow airports. So the conversion program is exceptionally important and necessary—the congress delegates are right."

We spoke with the secretary of the party committee of Agropromstroyobyedineniya from Kalinin Oblast, A. Rudenskiy. His opinion about the reports from the members of the higher party leadership?

"This was the first time I have been elected to the party congress. But as far as I know from the party history, such reports have never been given before," said Aleksandr Sergeyevich. "This is probably the first time for the people making the reports as well. This might be why certain reports remind one of regular speeches in discussions of the report of the Central Committee. I do not think it is an accident that applause sometimes breaks out in the hall and certain delegates wave their mandates over their heads. This is the way people usually react to speeches which give the listeners little information."

We heard similar responses from other delegates as well.

And the notes published by the Presidium also contained similar assessments of certain reports.

A well-known artist, congress delegate M. Ulyanov, was not a bit surprised when we asked him to share briefly his thoughts on the reports, on the present condition of agriculture, and the ways for the Soviet rural areas to emerge from their extremely deep crisis. At one time he displayed his talent in playing the role of a chairman in a film by the same name, the role of a leader—honest, inspired, and at the same time fretting in solitude over the unsolved, "eternal" problems of life. Mikhail Aleksandrovich admitted that here too, at the congress, he, like his hero, never stops thinking about the "accursed" questions. Indeed, how can we restore our rural areas and ultimately solve the food problem?

"It is now obvious to us that no individual measures, including modern technical equipment and technology, will produce the desired result," said M. Ulyanov. "Have you even thought about why, for example, the three percent of the farms in the country that are individual farms produce 60 percent of the potatoes? A significant fact. It attests to personal interest above all. If we do not untie the hands of the proprietor and awaken in him an interest in working on the land we shall be eternally faced with these tiresome questions...

"As M.S. Gorbachev said, we need to radically change our attitude toward the peasant and toward rural areas as a whole. And what is happening now? Many kolkhozes and sovkhozes have completely broken down, they are not producing any profit, and we are trying to save them.

This is unnatural under the conditions of a normal economy. In a word, let the strong farms continue to exist and develop, but those that are not succeeding should simply be eliminated. We should muster our courage and eliminate them. But sometimes people try to save them through leasing. But frequently administrators distort its essence to the point where it is unrecognizable. Since we are proclaiming the possibility of various forms of management, we should contribute to their development not in words but in deeds..."

Mikhail Aleksandrovich, have you no desire to play the role of a new kolkhoz [collective farm] leader?

"A difficult question. If I had been assigned to play the role of the selfless chairman now, of course, I would have played it differently. The times are changing and our ideas are changing as well. I keep up my personal relationship with Bagin, the kolkhoz chairman from Gorkiy Oblast. He is an intelligent, real farm leader. Incidentally, he helped the parishioners build a church and he goes there himself sometimes. The people see this and value it. They have respect for him. This is not a matter of having the same religion. Any such act shows wise far-sightedness and has its goal. Another leader, on the contrary, will change from the former creator and leader into a conservative, a kind of dictator advocating serfdom... The system has changed him to conform to it. Where am I leading? It is time to change the entire system of human, economic, and political relations. Cosmetic changes are not enough. Yet when you hear certain reports you can still see a desire to get away from the immediate issues of perestroyka.

DANILYUK, chairman of the Khabarovsk Kray Soviet of People's Deputies, USSR people's deputy:

"Unfortunately, in the reports from members of the Politburo, I did not sense that urgent concern for the country which pervades the daily lives of our people. What is happening in the Far East? Khabarovsk Kray is an extremely large center of the defense industry and a traditional supplier of timber, gold, other nonferrous metals, and other raw material for the country. But when it comes to food the region has always lived on subsidies. It is not because our peasants are lazy and there are only 0.16 hectares of land per resident. But today state deliveries of food are being interrupted and the domestic market is becoming unbalanced. All right, even on these 0.16 hectares in recent years they have begun to maintain private subsidiary farms. They have reached a point where even in Nikolayevsk-on-Amur and Okhotsk there is practically not a single yard belonging to miners, fishermen, and hunters that does not have livestock. We should rejoice: We now have our own source of meat. But no, for this year the center has not even allotted the same volume of mixed feed as it did last year while the number of livestock has increased! And now during the heat of summer the residents of the Far East are sending their undernourished livestock for slaughter instead of properly fattening them until autumn and then entering the winter with their own food supplies. Why has this happened? Because the center is operating in the same old way: They are cutting the supplies of mixed feed so that they are equal for everyone, regardless of whether local conditions are suitable for their production or not. And yet we are reporting that grain production has increased!

"And what is the result? Mikhail Sergeyevich has noted our achievement in the international arena. Yes, because of its position as a gateway to the Asian-Pacific Ocean region, the Far East is experiencing this fairly clearly. Joint enterprises are growing rapidly and international trade has stepped up. But on this same international market we will be selling our last natural resources for a piece of meat unless we put our domestic economy in order.

"The consolidation of all healthy forces in society, which I expect from the congress, is not an eloquent slogan. Without it, just as before, we will have nobody who will think about our daily bread since everybody will be absorbed in the struggle for position, for power, for influence over the masses. And the masses, who are mowing our hay and preparing for winter right now, gave me this order before I departed: 'It is time to stop talking and start working.'

"I look at the stormy discussions on procedural issues and I automatically compare them with the meetings of the Japanese parliament I recently had occasion to attend. The discussion of the most important issue—providing for the elderly and underprivileged—took about an hour, the social security minister took 10 minutes for his report, the prime minister took seven minutes, the four deputies took five minutes each, and the finance minister answered questions for 15 minutes. That was all. When will we finally learn to value time?"

A. KOMOGORTSEV, department chief of the Kiev Higher General Military Command School:

"I regard reports at the congress from members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee as steps forward in the development of democracy within the party. Such a practice, whereby not only the secretary but also each member of the elective organ reports to the communists, should become the norm also for the lower levels and for all local party organizations. Only with this approach can we realistically evaluate both the personal contribution to solving the problems facing each activist and the degree of his personal responsibility for the matter entrusted to him.

"Unfortunately, one is left with only a depressing impression from the majority of reports heard today. It is especially clear from them: The structure of our party is still 'militarized' and our leaders have not yet become accustomed to fighting for influence over the people, apparently not yet having gotten rid of the stereotypical notion that the position itself gives them authority. I have in mind above all the speech by secretary of the CPSU Central Committee V.A. Medvedev. For he is an ideologist, and ideology, as I understand it, is not just

theory in and of itself, but also the ability to bring it to the masses. I cannot fully share this view because the bottom line is still the material base. Consequently, today we must devote attention to the condition of the economy above all. But in N.I. Ryzhkov's report, unfortunately, we did not hear an in-depth analysis of why the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress went unfulfilled—were they theoretically substantiated enough, was the distribution of forces incorrect during the course of their implementation, what is the underlying cause of our failures?

"But what are the ways out of the crisis? Here we are all saying—a market economy, a market economy... I sent a note to Nikolay Ivanovich with a question about this: To what extent have we taken into account the previous experience in our country's existence under the conditions of a market economy? After all, the situation that has developed here now is very similar to the one that existed on the eve of October 1917—the same extraordinary monopolization, the same all-pervasive control by the state. And the result—an explosion...

"I am for changes, this is simple, but do we have time for more experiments? We need a clear cut, theoretically verified strategy for restructuring the economy, and during the process of its development we must not forget that even today only a few prospering countries are living under the conditions of a market economy, very many of them are at the average level, and many of them are simply impoverished."

In the corridors of the congress when they have free moments many delegates usually try to gather together, frequently according to their professional interests: workers, peasants, party workers, literary and artistic figures, scholars, military people... During one of the recesses we had occasion to speak with the railroad workers. The secretary of the party committee of the Kuybyhsev locomotive depot, A. Sukhovershiy, did not want to talk about purely specialized problems of his collective or to share their problems. Just in passing he noted: They have formed the same kind of waiting list for motor vehicles as they have for housing—more than 400 people, which shows the pent-up demand. The workers have saved up money but there are no goods. But can these problems really be solved without the main thing: The people are disturbed about what will happen to the party, whether it will be able to overcome the crisis and protect the interests of the workers. Aleksandr Anatolyevich spoke with us about what was bothering them.

"Consider that the majority of delegates came to Moscow with a goodly supply of criticism—both against the Central Committee Politburo and the government and against specific departments and party and state workers. The more so since many of them did not get a chance to express their opinions or argue with their opponents at the Russian forum of communists. After the political report from the CPSU Central Committee and the reports from members and candidate members of the Politburo and secretaries of the Central Committee, of course, there will be criticism from left and right. And it is already coming out—in individual rejoinders, speeches, and notes to the presidium.

"All this is predictable. But I am afraid that we delegates are like the picky wife whose husband left her. Later, as you know, she went out onto the street with a sign saying: 'I demand that you return my husband!' But it was too late... Let me explain what I mean. It has almost become a sign of special courage to sling mud at the 'party elite,' not excluding our party's general secretary. As though they were the only ones to blame for our shortcomings and mistakes. But where were we—the secretaries of the party committees of the enterprises, raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms [rayon, city and oblast party committees]? Finally, where were the rank-and-file communists looking?

"In my opinion it is also wrong to divide up the delegates according to status and occupation—into conservatives and democrats, 'right wing,' 'left wing,' and 'center'... It seems to me that we are all concerned about the same thing: How to find a way out of the impasse, how to improve and consolidate the party ranks and make the CPSU the leading force. None of us wants anything bad either for ourselves or for those around us or for the party. So let us first of all look for ways to a consensus and mutual understanding and not exacerbate the causes of disagreements. To this end, in my view, it is necessary to be understanding about the conclusions of various platforms and trends, we should weed out what is unnecessary and arm ourselves with all that is the best and most valuable.

"To be honest, what especially alarms me? It was apparent: Many people in the hall want the leaders of our party to really respond, to answer oral questions from the floor. Alas, they decided to report with a 'united front' and respond to the notes after that. As a result certain reports were turned into regular discussions of the main report. Hence the dissatisfaction of a number of delegates."

"But still, Aleksandr Anatolyevich, the reports from the high leaders heard in the hall represent a new stage in the democratization of party life. During the times of stagnation this would have been regarded as an unheard-of encroachment on the authority of the Politburo and the Central Committee Secretariat."

"I agree. But we are not living according to the rules of the time of stagnation. And this is to the credit of the Politburo and M.S. Gorbachev personally. For example, I expected more from N.I. Ryzhkov's report. I was left without a clear idea of the measures taken by the government to implement the economic reform. In my opinion, we were left with more questions than we started with. Here are a couple of them. Why is collective property not permitted along with cooperative and private property? Do state enterprises have the same rights

as cooperative ones? When will measures against monopolies finally be developed and adopted?

"And another thing. Many people put their opponents in their place with what would appear to be a phrase for which there is no response: 'Enough talk! Let us do something!' But how do we do something, how do we work? For—excuse my harsh words—but the devil is also hard at work and that does nobody any good. A concept and precise guidelines are important.

"There are many things like this that are unclear," he added, "in questions both of party life and party construction. Although one thing is clear to everyone: The party is sick and it needs a radical cure. How can we cure it? We have many advisers. But only the serious professionals are useful. These are the party workers, including the congress deputies. We do not object if the gardener cures the tree and the veterinarian cures the animals. So let outside observers who have only a remote idea about our activity not interfere in purely party matters. I think the communists will figure out their own mistakes and deceptions. In order to make a precise diagnosis and earmark a correct course it is necessary to have a strict analysis and to reveal all views. Therefore we should not be afraid of criticism. But let it be balanced, constructive, and removed from any settling of personal or group accounts or departmental or regional interests."

In the conversation with A. Sukhovershiy and his railroad colleagues I repeatedly heard this judgment: Perhaps the most neglected branches in the country's national economic complex are agriculture and railroads. They need help from the state. The solutions to these problems will depend largely on the success of the economic reform. Nonetheless the rhythm on the railroads is not interrupted even for a second even now. What is the state of affairs today for the workers on the steel mainlines? This was discussed by USSR Minister of Railways N. Konarev.

"Taking into account the social tension in the coal mining regions," said Nikolay Semenovich, "we declared July the month for shipping coal. During the first two days of July the shipment of coal exceeded the amount planned. We did not want the coal miners to have any complaints against the railroad workers. The harvest is another area. In the Northern Caucasus, the south of the Ukraine, and the south of the Central Chernozem Zone the grain crop was fairly good. As we know, by a decision of the USSR Council of Ministers, an additional quantity of petroleum products was shipped to the rural areas. Our task was to deliver them to the consumers efficiently, for in the harvest every day and hour counts. And then we will transport the grain. Will there be problems? Alas, we cannot seem to avoid tie-ups. The situation in the Far East is difficult. Many trains filled with products for export are standing idle at the ports. There is no longer any room in the port warehouses for materials. And the slow-up does not contribute to enlivening ties with our foreign partners."

"Yesterday," Ye. Sotnikov, an electric welder from the Urgalskoye Mining Administration of the Primorskugol Production Association, reported to us, "we met with USSR Minister of Coal Industry, M. Shchadov. He appealed to the congress delegates: Help prevent a political strike by the miners, which a number of collectives of the country intend to declare on 11 July. I personally am against this form of fighting for our rights. And when there were strikes in the Donbass and the Kuzbass, our collective quite deliberately did not halt its work for a minute. But we still do not have complete information about how the government decree adopted in the wake of these events is being fulfilled! From our own life one might think that it is not being fulfilled at all. Everyone is talking about the independence of the labor collectives, but try to take advantage of it. And without it our mining administration is at an impasse. Departmentally we are included in an association located in Vladivostok. Naturally, all allocations end up there. And territorially we are in Khabarovsk Kray, which uses all material resources and construction subdivisions for its own projects. We are outsiders for both. A telegram from home came right here to the congress—they have halted the construction of the surgical complex in the village hospital. We were waiting for it to be introduced this year like manna from heaven. How long will we be chained down by channels on all sides?"

During one of the recesses the delegates formed a solid circle around the general director of the interbranch scientific and technical complex entitled "Microsurgery of the eye" of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Health, Svyatoslav Nikolayevich Fedorov. There were many questions for him. After all, it is one thing to receive information from the newspapers and television about how this oasis of health is flourishing on the soil of our impoverished public health system and quite another thing to hear it from the mouth of its creator himself. The lively discussion was interrupted by our colleague, a television journalist from Portugal, who asked S. Fedorov a question which is traditional these days:

"What do you expect from the congress?" Svyatoslav Nikolayevich smiled disarmingly:

"No concrete results. In general I have little faith in mass assemblies—rallies, demonstrations, protests, and so forth. I am convinced that they can essentially do little to solve the problems of our life. But I value such measures very highly for the fact that through them people become more free in their thoughts and actions. And the congress should, above all, help to emancipate us—a person under someone's thumb cannot make the country free or be happy himself. I wish one thing for M. Gorbachev: that he be able to keep the party apparatus from impeding perestroyka, or even better—orient them toward contributing to it."

L. Burtsev, designer at the Novosibirsk Sibselmash production association:

"A paradoxical situation has developed: During the process of the reports the congress would like to hear specifically what has been done by each member of the Politburo and each secretary of the Central Committee during the course of perestroyka, but we have not taken into account that the problems they are working on are global in nature and this makes it necessary to take a global approach to them as well. And they, in turn, have not taken into account that we are expecting from them clear and complete information about quite particular issues, the most important ones. As a result, the people who have ended up in the most advantageous situation are those who have a clear cut position regarding these problems: A.N. Yakovlev and Ye.K. Ligachev. They would seem to be two absolutely opposed individuals but the reports of the two delegates were met with applause.

"I would have experienced more satisfaction from the report of V. Vorotnikov—it was fairly interesting and substantial—if Vitaliy Ivanovich had not obviously given in to the moods and emotions prevailing among the delegates.

"I am convinced that the congress must solve two problems. The first is the development of a clear cut program to improve the life of the people and the second is the reorganization of the party. They are closely interconnected but priority, in my view, should be given to the second. If the party is transformed from a party-state organization into a political one, we will have the opportunity to influence all aspects of life. But this means that the party must become a totality of local units with the right to the deciding vote. Just as now during the time of changeover to a market economy the labor collectives are becoming the masters of the means of production, so the party organizations should become the masters of political life, who are clearly aware of their goals and are capable of leading everyone to them. People are tired of living in the future, and the present is being determined from below. But even the role of the 'higher ups' does not become less significant: to coordinate the work of the masses and give it real direction—this is no unimportant matter either.

"If we are able to restructure the party this way it means that we will be able to realize all of our plans and if we do not we can expect political stagnation and a breaking up into several parts."

After the dinner break a report on the work of the Central Audit Commission of the CPSU was given by the deputy chairman of the Central Audit Commission, A.A. Nizovtsev. A report on the budget and property of the party was given by the manager of affairs of the CPSU Central Committee, N. Ye. Kruchina.

At the beginning of yesterday's meeting the question arose of which members of the high party leadership intended to retire before the congress took place. Explanations were given by M.S. Gorbachev. He announced that such requests had come from N.N. Slyunkov and G.I. Usmanov because of their poor health, and also from V.I. Vorotnikov and A.P. Biryukova.

Then the deputies began to form commissions for drawing up the documents of the congress. Fairly heated debates broke out and it was necessary to defuse the situation even by such a method as switching chairmen: Ye.Ye. Sokolov was replaced by M.S. Gorbachev.

The delegates were scrupulous to the point of nit-picking not only with respect to the personal composition of the commission but also their titles and the candidate chairmen. Thus the resolution concerning the party economic policy underwent name changes and what they ended up with reminded one of a regulated market. The commission was headed by N.I. Ryzhkov.

The question of who would head the commission for the draft of the CPSU Rules. The delegates demanded that G.P. Razumovskiy's candidacy be brought to a vote and, judging from everything, the persistence of the demands forced Georgiy Petrovich to withdraw. M.S. Gorbachev became chairman of the commission.

It was also necessary to resort to voting when discussing the candidacy of the chairman of the commission for drawing up the agrarian resolution of the congress. Ye.I. Sizenko and V.A. Starodubtsev did not get a majority of the votes. Ye.K. Ligachev became the commission's chairman. Then a number of delegates suggested creating a commission for developing congress documents pertaining to such important problems as interethnic relations, the life of the Armed Forces, the political assessment of the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster, the situation surrounding the Aral, and the progress of the restoration work in the zone of the Armenian earthquake. A number of these proposals were adopted.

Yu.A. Manayenkov, chairman of the mandate commission, gave a brief report. He suggested considering the three representatives of party organizations from the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] congress delegates with an advisory vote. This decision was adopted by a vote. The circumstances for holding elections in the NKAO will be studied and reported later.

Thus ended the second day of the work of the congress.

Delegates Polled on Results of Congress

90UN2410A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 29, 21-27 Jul 90 p 3

[Report by V. Vasilyev, doctor of philosophical sciences, and L. Orlova, scientific associate: "How Should the Party Be?"]

[Text] Participating in a poll by the sociological service entitled "The Congress" under the leadership of Zh. Toshchenko, doctor of philosophical sciences, were 3,986 communists or 85 percent of the delegates at the 28th CPSU Congress. The poll was conducted during 29 June-1 July 1990 while the deputies were registering. Some 32 percent of the deputies see the causes of

society's crisis during the period of perestroyka in the crisis in the CPSU. And the majority of delegates who were questioned gave a basically negative evaluation to the ideological-educational (67 percent), theoretical (61 percent), and organizational (59 percent) activity of the party during past years. But a considerable share of them (about 40 percent) gave a positive rating to the CPSU political work directed toward democratization and consolidation of the society.

The majority of the congress delegates (70 percent) support the territorial-production principle of party construction and 73 percent of the communists think that the decisions of the congresses and conferences should be binding while the decisions of the party executive organs should be recommendations. The principle of democratic centralism, in the opinion of more than two-thirds of the congress delegates (68 percent), should be retained but the democratic principles should be strengthened. More than half (55 percent) are in favor of constructing the CPSU according to the federative principle. Some 64 percent were opposed to eliminating the party organizations in the Army, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Procuracy, and KGB.

How do the congress delegates envision the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? As a party of consolidation of all segments of society that support ideas of socialism (80 percent of those questioned). It is the conviction of many communists present at the congress that the most important condition to strengthen the party now is consolidation of all the trends within it (58 percent) and also purging of people who do not believe in the ideals of socialism (30 percent of those questioned).

Is the CPSU of tomorrow a party of the parliamentary or vanguard type? Twenty percent of the delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress who were questioned were in favor of a party of the parliamentary type and 67 percent were in favor of a party of the vanguard type.

A poll of delegates in which 2,103 people participated, which was conducted a week after the beginning of the work of the congress, shows that only 10 percent were satisfied with the initial results of the congress. The main reason for the dissatisfaction was the lack of constructive suggestions from the speakers (31 percent). Some 83 percent of the deputies think that only a rejuvenated party that has shifted significantly to the left is capable of bringing the country out of its crisis.

On the last day of the congress, 13 July, the delegates were again given a questionnaire with a request to express their opinion about the results of the congress. The questionnaire was filled in by 2,166 people. Almost half of the delegates questioned (49 percent) were satisfied with the results of the elections of the central party organs; with the content of the new CPSU Statutes—68 percent; with the content of the program statement of the 28th CPSU Congress "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism"—65 percent; and with the resolution on the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee—59 percent.

Will there be a split or will party unity be retained after the congress? Only 19 percent of the delegates were convinced that a split was inevitable. In order to strengthen the party, 49 percent of those questioned think it necessary to consolidate all existing trends in the party; 34 percent—to purge it of people not faithful to the ideals of socialism; and 21 percent—to purge it of conservatives.

Chief Editor Assesses Outcome of Congress

90UN2374A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 15 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA editor in chief Anatoliy Yurkov: "Who Won—the Leftists or the Rightists?"]

[Text] Will the people trust the communists after their 28th congress? The people themselves will say before long. It is important for us to size up whether the congress did everything to deserve this trust. Whether it registered the aspirations of its own party for a radical renewal? Whether it will assume the role not only of a spokesman, but also of a defender of the interests of the working person? Whether it merges with a society that is hungering for real deeds from the political vanguard?

A real and radical renewal of the party has begun. And it began with the main thing—with personnel, from the very "top," as was demanded by the "lower echelons." Among the secretaries of the Central Committee and the members of the Politburo almost no one remained of those who led the party to this point. For various reasons, they did not end up in the highest echelons of party authority, but, I repeat, the chief one was the demand from the "lower echelons." And, it must be supposed, the will of the general secretary, which was in accord with them.

In the democratization of the party, the congress did more than was done by all of the post-Lenin party biographies put together. In the last day of its work, on the demand of the "lower echelons," which were resolutely supported by the general secretary, the congress twice canceled its decision in order to increase the makeup of the Central Committee in favor of representatives from the localities.

Only those who wanted this very much could not see the signs of what was new in the work of the congress. Indeed, there were incorrect statements and personal attacks, to which the congress itself did not remain indifferent, and it censured them. Yes, there were speeches that were also "pro forma," and at times it was difficult to distinguish whether an executive or a party activist was speaking. But, perhaps for the first time in the last few decades, the delegates to the congress listened to and heard each other.

The spirit of party comradeship, it seems, is being revived in the deeds of communists and in the mutual relations between them. This means that eternal human values—kindness, conscientiousness, honesty, modesty, selflessness, and love of a close one and the Motherland—are again assuming importance and are in the same rank with such "purely party" qualities as ideological conviction.

The congress reacted with grateful applause to the announcement of K. Tyulebekov, first secretary of the Alma-Ata Obkom [oblast party committee]: The high-ranking party functionary refused proffered membership in the CPSU Central Committee in favor of delegate Kadyrbekova from Kazakhstan. And he was not alone in his action.

By an absolute majority of votes, the congress declared itself for the policy of Mikhail Gorbachev, for radical changes in society, and for the complete triumph of the ideology of new thinking. This is one significant response by those "well-wishers" for our renewal who in massive circulations broadcast their forecasts and opinions long before the opening of the congress: They said the apparatchiks elected themselves as delegates, and they will continue their apparatus games at the highest level.

No, there were no games. Although there were attempts to revive them. And there were "anti-games" attempts to stir up the congress in particular.

And there was a political campaign.

We saw for the first time, and with our own eyes, just what a political campaign is. And this lesson has still to be absorbed in order to move further in comprehending unusual realities.

It is now clear to us: If political parties arise, then they are sure to strive for authority, and they wage a campaign for it. Naturally, not against themselves, but against other political forces. "We campaigned against ourselves" for higher labor productivity, for "comradely treatment of women"... In a word, it is easier to recount what we, fighters from birth, did not fight for. But only not for authority.

In our country, an entirely conscientious people gladly entrusted authority to the party—the inspirer and organizer... The impression was created that no one needed authority, and everyone hastened to get rid of it, especially the people, and to place it on the shoulders of the unlucky persons in the Politburo who had no one to pass it on to. And they stoically carried this burden, and the people, from time to time, awarded them Gold Stars for their heroic labor.

But in the other—the real!—reality, a mustachioed despot with his gang paved his path to absolute power with millions of lives.

Another democrat and humanitarian—as is indicated by the now talkative former chief Chekist—was not averse to sending the chief of the party and the government to his forefathers in order to sit in his place. Get rid of him with a simple method: So that the aircraft would take off at one airfield, but not reach the other...

Thank heavens that now authority is being campaigned for completely peacefully. For the time being it is peaceful, but it is also irreconcilable. And, in my opinion, there is in this irreconcilability the residual symptom of bygone traditions.

Voting concluded the political career of such an experienced party member as Ye. Ligachev—the congress denied him the right to occupy the post of deputy to the general secretary. But he would not agree to less. Although before this, each of his appearances on the rostrum was accompanied by loud applause, and the impression was created that the hall sympathized with him.

But the general secretary insisted on another candidacy. And the congress once again expressed confidence in Gorbachev.

In fits of severe political hostility, dictated, of course, by the threat of loss of power, and with it certain privileges, somebody supported an unworthy reception. The incident, associated with a recurrent attack on the now former member of the Politburo, Central Committee Secretary A.N. Yakovlev, of course, is not an ordinary, extreme situation. But it also is not a personal attack, if one recalls the kind of radical program of reorganizations Aleksandr Nikolayevich supports.

Of course, it was not they, and similar critical subjects, that determined the course of discussions at the congress. Although they also did. But to ignore them is to simplify the picture and to lull social forces and the party.

Many of the delegates and guests at the congress with whom I talked on its last day did not conceal their serious concern over the demonstrative protest step taken by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. For, it seems, both his Sverdlovsk countrymen and the presidium of the congress showed him utmost respect and attention. Did he not see this, and did he not sense it?

My interlocutors reflected aloud. What lies behind Boris Nikolayevich's defiant step—excessive ambitions that count on the unconditional support of the people? History knows analogies: Dictators are met not that very infrequently in its pages.

What does his announcement mean that ostensibly he wants to remain outside the party in order to be objective as the highest authority in the republic? Is this a tactical move with a long-range aim? Modern life does not know one politician who would remain in power without being supported by his own party. I think that Yeltsin knows this. Well then, he left the Communist Party in order to gather other forces around himself, in opposition to it? But it is the ruling party, and it is not so

easy to take this role away from it. One way is to weaken it—to split it. Where will the next aggressive wave come from?

Some of my interlocutors did not exclude the possibility that Boris Nikolayevich has in this way begun an attack on the president of the country. For what reason? I think that if this is the case, the answer is simple.

However it may be, Yeltsin, it appears, obviously counted on a sensation and a split of the party no matter what sauce his challenge was served with. And here, in my opinion, Boris Nikolayevich miscalculated badly. Those who had become more mature and wiser during the days of congress work did not support him—not a half, not a third part, and not one-tenth. From the first to the last day, the delegates were concerned about renewing the party.

The process of democratization of society cannot be stopped even by arch conservatives—it will progress: None of us will voluntarily (and many even under duress) want to return to yesterday's condition.

Our national self-conscience will also move forward. But the sovereignty of nations and republics is inconceivable without the sovereignty of the individual, and the real freedom of each of us—economic, social, and moral. That which our renewed Union guarantees.

The congress met us halfway in its documents—the interests of the individual and individual rights and freedoms are designated the highest aim of the party. We have not gone through this yet.

So, who won at the congress—leftists or rightists? I am repeating the question that appears in the headline to these remarks. I think that the congress was guided by common sense. It, in the final analysis, won. So, the party is resolutely coming out of its ideological rigidity, and it is beginning to measure its successes not by the number of pronounced revolutionary phrases and pages of published resolutions, but by the feeling of the individual, the family, and society. I think that such a party has a right to count on the sympathy of the people.

CPSU Congress Editorial Apparatus Viewed

90UN2394A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 28, 14 Jul 90 p 8

[Interview with Levon Chakhmakhchyan, chief of the secretariat of the editorial apparatus under the Editorial Commission of the 28th CPSU Congress and senior official of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, by T. Vladimirova; place and date not given: "After Midnight in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses"—first paragraph is newspaper's introduction]

[Text] Among the various services that perform the normal work of such major forums as the CPSU congress, the editorial apparatus plays a far from unimportant role. Our interviewee is the chief of the secretariat of the editorial apparatus under the Editorial Commission of the 28th CPSU Congress and a senior official of the Ideological Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Vladimirova] Levon Khorenovich, let us first remind the readers that the editorial apparatus and the Editorial Commission are not one and the same thing, and they are sometimes confused.

[Chakhmakhchyan] They should not be confused, because the Editorial Commission is a working organ of the congress. It is elected from among the delegates, and it works on documents approved by the congress by analyzing proposals, supplements, and amendments to their drafts that are heard during discussions. But the editorial apparatus is just a congress service, although of no small importance. Its tasks include editing stenographic records of meetings, verification of quotes, names, titles, and factual material contained in speeches, and also the daily, or, more accurately, the nightly output of information bulletins for the delegates.

There is an average of 20-25 speeches at the congress in one day. Add to this numerous remarks and comments on procedure from 30 microphones. Remember, this is oral, frequently emotional, and therefore "disjointed" and abrupt speech. When the auditorium is raging at the microphones and the speakers do not have time to choose their words, they resort to gestures, nods, and a stream of "so to say" and "so"... Sitting in the auditorium or at a television set, we understand this speech clearly, right down to the implication. But the "raw" stenographic record—this is what an absolutely identical deciphering is called—turns out to be a totally unintelligible text. Bringing it to a literary standard, while not distorting its sense, is laborious work.

[Vladimirova] And how many persons are employed in the editorial apparatus?

[Chakhmakhchyan] About 200. This is 50 persons less than at the 19th party conference.

[Vladimirova] Quite a few. Almost a full staff of a large newspaper.

[Chakhmakhchyan] In fact, that is so: It is a simplified model of an editorial staff. There is a main editorial office, which includes the managers, leading workers of large newspapers, and veterans of the press. There are proofreaders, a machine bureau, and technical services. Two groups engaged in direct editing are formed from journalists and workers of the Ideological Department of the Central Committee. There is a group of consultants from the State Committee for Statistics—they verify the correctness of figures, statistical data, etc., that are cited in speeches. And, finally, there is a liaison group which ensures timely review by delegates of their speeches.

[Vladimirova] In what way, other than a longer workday, does the activity of the editorial apparatus of the 28th congress differ from the work at previous congresses?

[Chakhmakhchyan] I did not work in the editorial apparatus of previous congresses. But I think that we all remember well from publications and personal experience how speeches were prepared and how congresses were held in the stagnant years. The mandatory composition of speakers: representatives of all republics, party kraykoms [kray party committees], party obkoms [oblast party committees], and then representatives of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia... They all spoke general words, there were almost no troublesome problems which it would be worth "fighting" over, nothing personal and tormenting...

Today, the very attitude toward editing has changed among both the editors and the delegates. People now have OPINIONS, and no one wants them to be wittingly or unwittingly distorted. Therefore, the work on the texts is fault-finding, and at times anxious. The main principle is a minimum of correcting, and only where there are obvious mistakes or distortion of thinking. And, invariably, with the participation of the author of the text. The liaison group engages in either inviting delegates to the editorial offices to read the stenographic record on the spot and review the correction, or, if the matter occurs in the evening, the stenographic record is sent to the delegates.

[Vladimirova] The congress was telecast fully only in the last days. Information bulletins virtually do not find their way outside the Palace of Congresses. When can we expect a collection with stenographic accounts?

[Chakhmakhchyan] In about three months, I think.

Political & Social

Presidential Decree on Foreign Economic Ties

LD2407180290 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—The Soviet Union significantly modifies its practice of economic relations with foreign countries, which it pursued for many years.

In the decree by the USSR president, which was presented for publication today, these changes are warranted by "the transition to a market economy, the course of openness and greater involvement in the world economy, as well as the real account of current socio-economic and political changes in the member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the world as a whole."

The president charged the USSR Government with ensuring the transition from January 1, 1991, in relations with the CMEA member-countries, to settlements in freely convertible currency and for world prices. Bills and the drafts of other acts necessary to provide legal support for this transition will be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Economic cooperation with developing countries will be built "on the principles of mutual benefit and interests and be guided by international standards and practice". Economic aid "should be given with account of our country's real potentialities".

The USSR Council of Ministers and the Councils of Ministers of the Union republics were proposed to make maximum use of the new forms of economic cooperation with foreign countries and ensure conditions for an extensive involvement of enterprises and associations in foreign economic ties.

Presidential Decree Bans Armed Units

Decree Announced

LD2507120790 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 25 TASS—Armed units, not envisaged under Soviet legislation, are illegal and to be disbanded within 15 days, the Soviet president said in a decree here today.

Weapons, ammunition, explosive substances, military hardware and other types of munitions are to be surrendered to representatives of the USSR Interior Ministry within the same period of time.

The decree calls on republican and local bodies of power, militia units subordinate to them, and Soviet Interior Ministry and the USSR State Security Committee to ensure the confiscation of these weapons, ammunition, explosive substances, hardware and other types of military munitions, if this demand is not met, and hand them over to the units of the USSR Defense Ministry.

If actions of the above armed groups endanger the safety of the population and the state, the Soviet Interior Ministry has the right to use interior troops, and units of the Soviet Defense Ministry may become involved in some operations.

The above decree was issued in response to the creation of armed groups in some regions, with the connivance of local authorities, which are not part of the USSR Armed Forces, Border, Interior and Railway troops and other paramilitary units, envisaged by the Soviet legislation.

These groups provoke tensions, destabilise the situation and threaten people's lives. Such actions are accompanied by the seizure of arms, attacks on servicemen and militia men and on various military and civilian facilities. They are connected with the commission of other grave crimes, and lead to casualties among innocent people. Criminals, draft dodgers or deserters from the Armed Forces are often drawn into these groups.

Decree Explained

LD2507122490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] The president of the country has issued a decree on banning the creation of armed groupings not envisaged by the legislation of the USSR, and the confiscation of arms in instances where they are being held illegally.

In accordance with article 73 of the constitution of the USSR and the laws of the USSR on the delimitation of plenary powers between the USSR and the subjects of the federation, the creation of armed groupings comes under the exclusive jurisdiction of the USSR, in the person of its supreme bodies of state power and administration.

Any acts by other bodies and organizations to set up such groupings, regardless of their aims, are illegal.

On the basis of point one of article 127/3 of the constitution of the USSR, the president decrees:

Armed groupings, armed associations, detachments, vigilante groups, sub-units, or other organized armed groups set up in the territory of the USSR that are not envisaged in the legislation of the USSR are illegal, and must be disbanded within 15 days from the date of the publication of this decree.

Arms, ammunition, explosives, military hardware, and other military supplies in the possession of these groupings must be surrendered to representatives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR within the same time limit.

In case of non-fulfillment of the above requirement, republican and local bodies of power and the internal affairs bodies under them, and also the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR and the USSR State Committee for Security, are to ensure the confiscation of such arms, ammunition, explosives, equipment, and other military supplies, and the relevant subunits of the Ministry of Defense of the USSR are to accept them for keeping.

If the actions of the aforementioned armed groupings constitute a threat to the safety of the people and the state, the minister of internal affairs of the USSR has the right to use internal troops, and in specific operations the participation of sub-units of the Ministry of Defense of the USSR is permitted.

Decisions and actions by any bodies or organizations, officials, or citizens aimed at preserving previously created armed groupings or creating new ones not envisaged in the legislation of the USSR, have no legal force, and will entail accountability in accordance with the law.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Procuracy of the USSR are required to urgently tackle bringing criminal charges, in accordance with the existing legislation, against persons belonging to illegal groupings who have not voluntarily surrendered the weapons they hold, for the illegal carrying, holding, acquisition, production, or selling of arms, ammunition, or explosives.

The USSR Procurator General, and the procurators of Union and autonomous republics are required to take these issues under their personal control. Republican and local bodies of power and administration, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Defense, and the USSR State Security Committee, and other ministries, departments, and organizations which possess or which manufacture weapons must take the necessary measures without delay to rule out the illegal manufacture, removal, negligent storage, and loss of weapons, ammunition, explosives, combat equipment, and other military supplies.

Individuals who have permitted the loss of weapons or their sale are to be brought to account in accordance with the law.

Responsibility for the fulfilment of the decree is to be placed personally on the chairmen of the Council of ministers of Union and autonomous republics, and also on USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Bakatin; Chairman of the USSR State Security Committee Kryuchkov; USSR Minister of Defense Yazov; and their local bodies.

The complete text of the decree is being published in the press.

Kalugin Charged With 'Divulging State Secrets'

PM2407151190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Prosecutor's Office"]

[Text] On the basis of KGB materials, the USSR Prosecutor's Office began criminal proceeedings 17 July 1990 on the elements of a crime as envisaged by Article 75 of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Criminal Code (divulging state secrets).

In June-July 1990, information constituting a state secret was disseminated in the USSR and in foreign mass media citing and on behalf of O.D. Kalugin, a former major general of the USSR KGB.

The preliminary investigation and oversight of the execution of the laws in the investigation of this case have been entrusted to the Main Military Prosecutor's Office.

Kalugin Challenges Polozkov for Parliament

PM2507102790 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 29, 29 Jul-5 Aug 90 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Defrocked KGB General Accepts the Challenge"]

[Text] Krasnodar—Former KGB Major General Oleg Kalugin was nominated (93 votes to 3) USSR deputy in the national-territorial electoral district No. 15 among

more than ten other nominees at the conference of the gas research institute in Krasnodar the day the 28th CPSU Congress closed.

The deputy seat had become vacant after Ivan Polozkov, the then first secretary of the Krasnodar CPSU territorial committee and head of the local government had to give up his seat as USSR people's deputy. After losing the Russian presidency to Boris Yeltsin, Polozkov was elected first secretary of the Russian Communist Party. He is expected to move to Moscow and thus give up both his party and government positions in Krasnodar. Polozkov no longer needs his seat in the territory's government, so he now appears to be trying to win back his seat in the USSR parliament. The irony of fate now has Oleg Kalugin facing competition from the same Polozkov, who was nominated by several collective and state farms in the Krasnodar territory.

That Polozkov insisted on running for three seats was undoubtedly because he had certain plans in Russia. One can only guess why Ivan Polozkov is trying to recover the seat he gave up. Addressing more than 1,300 people who nominated him, Oleg Kalugin said: "I stepped on this soil with some trepidation because the Krasnodar territory is regarded as a stronghold of conservatism. But I have decided that it is officials who are conservative, not the people."

Preparations of New Union Treaty Work Viewed

PM2407190790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[A. Davydov report: "How the Preparation of the Union Treaty Is Coming Along"]

[Text] A news conference on the preparation of the new Union treaty was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center on Zubovskiy Boulevard on 24 July.

Soviet and foreign journalists heard a report from G.I. Revenko, member of the Presidential Council. Among other things he said:

As you know, a joint session of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation was held recently. Two questions were examined—on the market and on progress in the preparation of the Union treaty. These questions are closely connected today. The main conclusion which the session's participants reached is that we need a union of republics with equal rights but a renewed one which fits normally into the modern world. That is why the main task today is the renewal of the Union. What was agreed on at the Presidential Council? Primarily that it is necessary to go further in elaborating the concept of the new Union treaty.

Some people think that the center will continue to be represented by the structures that exist today. But that is a delusion. The formula which we arrived as is this: First and foremost the Union will be managed from below by organs democratically elected at local level. Furthermore, the formation of these organs must be carried out at the same time as the transfer to the market.

It is planned that the main principles of the new Union treaty will be formulated in general outline by the end of the year. Talks between the center and the republics have already begun. It was noted at the Presidential Council session that it would be desirable to ensure calm in the country for the period that the Union treaty is being formulated.

I want to stress once again: We reached the conclusion that the Union must be preserved. That is dictated by geopolitical, historical, and many other factors. But a renewed Union must be built on the foundation of the broadest sovereignty of its constituent republics and on the principles of the unity of the tasks of building a civil society and a rule-of-law state, the practical realization of the priority of the interests of the individual, voluntariness, and a differentiated approach to entry into the Union.

There is much discussion about the primacy of republics' laws over Union laws. In principle this is to be welcomed. But the Union laws, we are convinced, will be valid across the whole territory of the USSR.

G.I. Revenko dwelt on the order of future work on the Union treaty. As agreed at the Presidential Council session, after the talks with the republics their Supreme Soviets could examine all aspects of the treaty, which could then be submitted to nationwide referendum and after that it would be ratified.

In conclusion G.I. Revenko answered numerous questions from journalists.

Revenko on Possible New Union Treaty

LD2507005690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1737 GMT on 24 July broadcasts a 22-minute edition of the "Topical Interview" program, which takes the form of a discussion on the possible shape of a new Union treaty. It is chaired by correspondent Aleksandr Abramov, with the following participants: R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet; G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Standing Commission on Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations; G.I. Revenko, a member of the USSR Presidential Council; and B.I. Oleynik, deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. They are shown seated in a room said to be in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's building. There is no indication of the date of the discussion.

The participants discuss views on the nature of the Union treaty, noting its function in delimiting the powers to be assigned to the center and the republics and speculating in general terms about the way ahead. Nishanov raises the Baltic issue: "In accordance with a

decision by the Council of the Federation on 12 June, the majority of republics authorized delegations. I would describe these delegations as being on a working level. We would like to invite the Lithuanian comrades, the Latvian comrades, and the Estonian comrades to participate in this process, because it involves having several options for our Union and our ties. A voluntary union will be unified, but there will be several options for our ties between republics and the Union. It has been stressed, in particular at sessions of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation, that in fact, when we formed the Union in 1922, that almost contained the basis of a federative structure. It was there as a model. In practice, things went a different way, the way of unitarianism, but we now want to create a real, strong Union of sovereign states. And in that Union, if the Baltic republics want to have some kind of special status, taking account of historical and other circumstances, the republics could find such a place after discussing and reaching mutual agreement. Therefore, our idea is not to destroy the existing Union, but truely to create it anew and to strengthen it as somewhere that each republic and each nation could have its place."

Revenko, speaking next, notes: "We have left out this important principle, the principle of equal rights; equal rights of republics, equal rights of peoples, and equal rights for the person. This is a highly important principle for building the Union. Returning to the Union treaty, I want to say that there are already many versions of a new Union treaty. I have received several personally. Now, new versions have been prepared. There are versions from groups and individual citizens. There are versions produced by our scientific institutions. They take in a great deal. Incidentally, I should say that in all the efforts which are being made in the republics and at the center, the political aspects of the treaty have gone further than the economic ones. Evidently, the main disputes will be concentrated on the economic problems of the union and, in particular, on such important components of the state as the credit and banking system, foreign policy activity, who should have the hard currency, and how much should be deducted. That is the first thing.

"The second is that we are evidently facing the need to reinterpret the so-called role of the center; what is meant by the Union and what is meant by the center. Of course, the most acceptable way would be for the Union to be directed from below. But, I am an adherent of the theory that each member state should bear responsibility for the Union, and not as now, where some sort of center is responsible for the Union, while the republic is as though not responsible for the creation of the Union. We believe that the result must be equal responsibility of all for the Union which we have created."

After an interjection from Abramov, Revenko continues: "Today, we have manifestations where a republic wants to be in the Union, while Union laws are directly flouted. I do not want to give specific addresses; everybody knows what I mean. When a law is adopted, it is cancelled on the spot, to the detriment of the republic's own people. Interethnic conflicts arise, and—let us put it bluntly—people die. Is that not a flouting of Union laws? A future Union like that cannot exist. That is very important.

"Everybody is now hearing about the principles of the Union treaty. We have to evaluate very calmly the declarations which are being adopted and must not submit, so to speak, to malicious anger or haste. They are diverse, but among these nine declarations which have already been adopted there are declarations, there is a constitutional law, and there are decisions by Supreme Soviets. We already have 10 and more principles which correspond fully to what we need to enable us to form a union, beginning with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the Ukraine. It was even stated yesterday by a representative of Lithuania that even they see certain component elements for a Union treaty; in particular, defense, the border, and protection of the rights of the minority which speaks another language, as we put it. There is that too.

"We might agree today on one set of principles, but tomorrow they will come to the conclusion, for example, that it is not advantageous for a particular republic to deal with something. It makes a request. But, to whom does it make that request? It requests the Union, all fifteen, to accept these powers or it asks for the range of its competences to be handed over to the Union. That is more advantageous. Let us take a simple matter. Surely a small republic or state is not up to having 130 embassies or defending its interests in foreign trade today? Surely we are not going to set up 15 ministries and 150 embassies? Let us think. The Soviet Union has acquired so many international obligations over 70 years. We also have to think about how they are to be divided. That is very serious. The same applies to the fact that the Soviet Union has quite a lot of debts. Are they going to be counted as just Moscow's or Kiev's?"

Nishanov interrupts, after which Revenko continues: "It is very serious, but primacy in everything must belong to a Union where human rights, liberties, and dignity are protected without any exceptions."

After another brief exchange with Nishanov, Revenko returns to the substance of his statements: "It should also be said about the sovereignty of Union laws and republican laws, that these are disputes. Obviously, what is with in the competence of the Union will be regulated by Union law, and the republic must hand this over to Union law. Or, perhaps it is like this: A republic accepts certain articles from a Union law and does not accept others. That is a matter for agreement. There is no dispute today over transport, power engineering, space, nuclear power. There is no dispute over the fact that these must be above and be managed as a complex system, as they say, as with defense, the borders, and so on. But, evidently, as for collective ownership, individual ownership of the means of production, among other things—that is how we have covered up private ownership in our documents—that will all go at its own

pace as the economy is radicalized. I agree that there will be arguments on this point, and they must be overcome. But, evidently, the principlal arguments will be between what this authorized group signs and the opinion of the main mass of the people."

Revenko Contends Single State 'Predetermined'

LD2407172590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Grigoriy Revenko, member of the Presidential Council, today spoke in favor of preserving the Union of sovereign socialist states at a news conference held in the capital with Soviet and foreign journalists. It was devoted to aspects of the conclusion of a new Union treaty. In his view, the existence of a single state was predetermined by history itself, and today the sovereign Soviet republics cannot do without it for a number of reasons.

Only the USSR Government has the right, therefore, to tackle many questions. It must see to it that international treaties and pacts are enforced on the country's territory. Apart from questions whose solution belongs to the competence of the republics, there are many common functions, such as the practical implementation of the equality of all the peoples, the protection of the borders, and the establishment of market relations within the country.

The member of the Presidential Council talked about how the work of preparing a new Union treaty was proceeding. Particular attention at the news conference was devoted to economic aspects of the treaty. The member of the Presidential Council answered numerous questions from journalists.

Prokofyev Views Party, State Function Division

LD2507084790 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] The delimitation of functions between the Communist Party and the state is nearing completion in the Soviet Union. This has been said by the Politburo member Yuriy Prokofyev. Commenting on the results of the 28th party congress, he emphasized that the newly elected Politburo, the party's supreme political leadership body, no longer includes the prime minister, defense, or other ministers of the USSR.

From now on, Prokofyev explained, the Communist Party would deal only with its political issues. As for state affairs, they would be run by the country's parliament, Presidential Council, and government.

Prokofyev quoted the 28th congress' major statement as saying that the party gives up monopolism and stops dictating ideology. It will carry out its work in the conditions of a multiparty system and democracy in Soviet society.

Workers in Far East Protest Nuclear Submarines

AU2407123090 Paris AFP in English 1222 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] MOSCOW, July 24 (AFP)—Some 400 workers at the Soviet Pacific port of Vanino, opposite Sakhalin Island, held a warning strike Monday to demand the withdrawal of nuclear submarines from the bay, INTERFAX, a semi-independent news agency reported here Tuesday.

The employees have threatened to hold a 24-hour strike on August 23 if the submarines, on which work is being carried out, are not withdrawn, INTERFAX said.

Meanwhile, some 250 people demonstrated Monday outside the Balakovo nuclear power station in the Saratov region of central Russia to protest the construction of two more reactors—the fifth and sixth—at the plant, INTERFAX said.

Gorbachev Holds Conference on Union Treaty

PM2507084390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Working Conference"]

[Text] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev held a working conference 23 July to develop the accords secured at the recent joint sitting of the Council of the Federation and the USSR Presidential Council. The conference participants exchanged opinions on the interdependent processes of transition to the market and creation of a new Union treaty.

Presidential Council Members Yu.D. Maslyukov, Ye.M. Primakov, and A.N. Yakovlev; R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet; I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; V.S. Pavlov, USSR finance minister; and B.G. Fedorov, RSFSR finance minister, took part in the conference.

Addressing the conference, M.S. Gorbachev stressed the need to coordinate positions and ensure close interaction between central and the corresponding RSFSR departments.

Gorbachev's Post-Congress Status Pondered

PM2507092990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Kiva: "Will the Party Catch Up With Perestroyka? Reflections on the CPSU's Future After the Congress"]

[Text] The results of the work of the congress that has just finished still have to be interpreted. It is only at first sight that everything seems simple. Here, for example, is what a colleague of mine said about the congress: "The apparatchiks, wounded by the painful loss of their

monopoly on power and on the ultimate truth, ill-educated, and incapable of competing in open political struggle, managed to unite and carry out extensive anti-Gorbachev activity among the masses. Encouraged by their initial successes, they set off for Moscow to take revenge. Not disguising their hatred of democracy, the multiparty system, the creative intelligentsia, any proponent of innovative, original thinking, the intellect, and intelligence in general, the conservatives intended to start 'scuttling' perestroyka and 'slow hand-clapping' it as a phenomenon."

We will return to the "scuttling" and "slow hand-clapping." But how is one to explain, I asked my colleague, the fact that the congress delegates did nevertheless elect M. Gorbachev as general secretary of the Central Committee and V. Ivashko, also a well known supporter of deep reform, as his deputy, rejecting Ye. Ligachev, the recognized leader of the conservatives, for the post. The adopted party documents are on the whole in keeping with the spirit of perestroyka. They do of course contain quite a deal of wishy-washiness and some things are still tinged with revolutionary rhetoric. But, first, this is a step forward nevertheless, and a considerable one for a party so burdened by conservatism and dogmatism. Second, life will certainly make adjustments to the documents (program documents age rapidly during a revolution). And third, the congress decisions will be carried out by people, and from this standpoint the congress has done a good job: It has at last become clear who is who.

Were it not for "slow hand-clapping" and "scuttling" we would have missed seeing in all their glory the prototypes of those who met at congresses and made the "historic" decisions whose implementation has led us to the most profound crisis. At last we saw the faces of those who oppose perestroyka. I also see a certain encouraging outcome in this "slow hand-clapping" and "scuttling"—the liberation of people, their deliverance from fear of authority, and the acquisition of the right to their own opinion. The era of bogus unanimity is now, it seems, disappearing into the past for good.

No matter how much you might like to, you cannot regard the congress as a forum of like-minded people. Few people concealed their positions on this occasion. And a surprisingly broad spectrum of views was revealed. There are the typical centrists, and the left centrists. And the typical conservatives. However, there are also those who want to retain totalitarian structures and are effectively opposed to social progress. There are also left-wing radicals and Marxist fundamentalists. The fairytale of the monolithic party was thus disposed of.

Is this good or bad? It's good, in my opinion. We do not now have to lie about our "iron ranks" or go to great lengths to hide our party's ills—it is now time to cure them.

But what if there is a split? That too would be no great misfortune, I think. We know quite a few parties with deep historical roots which have frequently split. But each new split has made them more homogeneous and cohesive and, most importantly, has been a strong incentive to their renewal. As a result these parties have remained influential, even the most influential, parties in society. This applies, for example, to the Indian National Congress. In our case the departure from the CPSU of some part of it on the right or left flank would merely help the process of forming a multiparty system.

The CPSU as the ruling party would only benefit from helping the emergence of informal social movements, organizations, and even parties of a progressive persuasion in those regions which suffered particularly badly during the years of totalitarianism. The whole atmosphere there is fraught with the danger of various kinds of social explosions, and the current official structures are often incapable of regulating the growing social protest. To avoid future friction and conflict the CPSU could help provide the newly formed democratic parties with premises, a publishing base, and so forth. And in general it is desirable that the CPSU leave the state party mentality behind as soon as possible. The world of illusions is fine for youngsters, but not for political parties.

I think it would be frivolous to contend that today's congress has opened up before the party a way of turning into a modern political organization capable of providing answers to the challenges of the time. And the main obstacle, in my view, is the cadres. We are all children of our time. And yet the level of many delegates' theoretical training simply depresses me. I noted the purely static notion of socialism, its social base, forms of ownership, the working class, and even social progress. This is despite the fact that congresses are usually attended not by the rank and file, but by their leaders, the most impressive representatives of the movement. That at least is the way it should be. An academician of my acquaintance would usually say when coming across an absurdity in a social sciences article: "You will agree that I am not the most backward person in society, but I fail to understand a single thing that is being said here." I admit I sometimes found myself in the same situation when listening to many delegates' speeches.

Quotations were often made from the classics to confirm the correctness of a particular stance. Yet the socioeconomic realities according to which Marx and even Lenin operated mostly do not exist today. And social progress is a historical concept. As is socialism. How is it possible not to see this, how is it possible not to understand that every epoch, if it does not discard the old terms, fills them with new content. We have turned the word "socialism" into an incantation. We quite often approach the very complex phenomena of life today from the standpoints of our own not very literate and sometimes plain illiterate fathers and grandfathers according to the principle: "Are you for or against socialism?"

I am not exaggerating here. Voices in favor of creating a mass movement in support of socialism were heard at the congress. The indefatigable Ligachev also came out with such an initiative, I think. What kind of socialism, one wonders. The kind which has never existed in our country or the regimented, administrative-edict version which led us to our historical impasse? Of course there is no answer, and cannot be. For many of us socialism has turned into an abstract slogan, at best a symbol of faith.

The 28th CPSU Congress spoke a lot about ownership, but did so outside the historical context, without appreciating that the institution of private ownership has been a very great achievement of human civilization. Several generations of revolutionaries considered private ownership of the means of production to be the source of all evil. However, its absence turned out to be a far greater evil. It eventually leads to the economic, social, and spiritual degradation of society.

The results of the 28th congress were also of personal significance for me. After the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Constituent Congress I was faced with the question of the advisability of staying in the same party as the Makashovs, Rebrovs, Sergeyevs, Ligachevs, and so forth. What do I have in common with them? Nothing! However, I decided to wait until the 28th CPSU Congress. During the first days of its work, when at times unbridled, crude attacks, mixed with plain boorishness, ignorance, and feeblemindedness, were launched against the policy of perestroyka and Gorbachev personally, I was merely hardened in my decision that I had to leave the party. But by the middle of the congress Gorbachev and his supporters had managed to radically alter the general mood and direct the forum into a radical, creative channel. And I said to myself: "Some of my colleagues, and, moreover, highly talented, honest, principled, and socially active ones, have already quit the party. Suppose I and others also leave. Whom will M. Gorbachev and those who think like him be left with? At this juncture in history the CPSU is needed to advance perestroyka. But if it is shorn of a considerable section of the creative intelligentsia and the most politically developed section of the working class, who then will remain? What if we try nevertheless to radicalize the party and renew its cadre composition and ideology?"

As emerged later, I was not the only one facing this choice. Many people thought: Uncultured apparatchiks, torpid generals, agrarian monopolists, and their like cannot represent the image of the party. There is something wrong here. The standing of the bureaucracy in society is pretty low, that of the party apparatus even lower. At the same time these two categories of people made up around two-thirds of congress delegates. How could this happen? People should have monitored the election of congress delegates. It became clear to me that the system of delegating communists to the congress was defective.

There is no denying that the work of the first days of the 28th CPSU Congress left a painful impression. And it has not disappeared yet. I am not wholly certain that the party with its present cadres is capable of becoming the vanguard and "catching up with" perestroyka. Nor do the people whom I have contact with at work and elsewhere possess such certainty. But at the same time I am flatly opposed to the standpoint of those who think that the worse the situation in the CPSU, the better it is for society. You will recall the talk that if, after I. Polozkov became first secretary of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, Ye. Ligachev were still elected a leader of the CPSU, the question of the party would resolve itself irrevocably and definitively. The party would begin to disintegrate.

It is amazing what great masters of simple solutions we are. Suppose that the CPSU suffers political bankruptcy, what then? The country is in crisis, the economy is up for grabs, spirituality is beneath criticism, and the crime situation is becoming dramatic in some places. There are no other strong, authoritative parties, at any rate for the time being. The soviets have on the whole yet to stand on their own feet. Society would be in grave danger. I am not thinking at all of a military coup, with which some people seek to intimidate us. I regard it as it impossible and pointless: What would the military do after a coup in a vast country such as ours? The question requires no answer. Something else is far more dangerous: the state's transformation into utter and uncontrollable chaos. Moreover, it it should be remembered that we are a huge military power crammed with nuclear weapons and have nuclear power stations and chemical plants. This obliges us all to act with the utmost responsibility.

To be frank, I am sometimes taken aback by the political blindness of those who consider themselves true supporters of perestroyka. In criticizing M. Gorbachev they forget that politics is the art of the possible. Yet what M. Gorbachev often does in the interests of perestroyka actually goes beyond the realm of the possible. Just look at the way the 28th congress began and how it ended. The possible must take account of the correlation of forces as a whole and in the concrete situation, the maturity and nature of mass consciousness, and many, many other things. We need more responsibility and less wild talk. I can see both on left and right. On the left when radicals newly emerged from a state of political nonexistence exaggerate their forces and readiness to govern the country. On the right when conservatives think that they can still take revenge on history.

I regard as typical impudence the actions of the right at the two congresses, particularly the RSFSR Communist Party Congress, when they decided that they could do without the centrists and Gorbachev and that they would be supported by the people. What other than utter irresponsibility toward the party, the people, and the country and the purest impudence was Ye. Ligachev's behavior at the congress! The man will be seventy in a couple of months. And he literally seeks to foist himself upon the party. Gorbachev did not propose him as his

deputy but, on the contrary, indicated V. Ivashko as the man with whom he would like to work. Many delegates rejected Ligachev, but he stuck to his guns—I want to lead, and that's an end to it!

But suppose he had been elected deputy general secretary. The party committees would have been snowed under with party cards the next day. An open struggle would have begun in the party leadership and spilled over into the republics and oblasts. Where are communist Ligachev's sober assessments of the situation in the country and his own role in the party?

Recent events have faced not just rank-and-file communists but also their leaders with a choice. B. Yeltsin, G. Popov, A. Sobchak, V. Shostakovskiy, and others have already made theirs. M. Gorbachev too was faced with a choice—for the umpteenth time! "Whose side are you on—the apparatus or the people?" a left-wing radical hurled at him. Oh, how our one-sided war-communist upbringing hampers us! So far as we are concerned, either left-wingers, or right-wingers, indeed, anyone who is not with us is against us. But for a major politician there can be no simple solutions. Particularly when the leader of a "revolution from above" is involved. If people think that a "revolution from below" is superior to a "revolution from above" I recommend they refresh their knowledge about the recent revolution in Iran, which supplanted the shah's "White Revolution," and carefully weigh up all the pros and cons. But the fusion of two revolutions is another matter. That is what Gorbachev is seeking, in my opinion. At the RSFSR Communist Party Congress he was openly challenged for the first time. The situation changed drastically. The conservatives, hitherto on the defensive, went resolutely on the offensive, but not against the left, as they had before in some measure or other, but against the centrist forces headed by Gorbachev. Apparatchiks of a Stalinist-Brezhnevite stamp, representatives of the top brass out of touch with the officers, enlisted personnel, and life, as well as some workers representing it was not quite clear whom leveled absurd charges against Gorbachev. There were insulting hints that he is virtually betraying and destroying the Warsaw Pact Organization, the socialist community, and so forth.

And then, it seemed to me, our leader faltered and lost his head. Did he not expect such pressure? After all, until now he had found it comparatively easy to play the role of arbiter able to find the vector of the common interests of the different political forces. Instead of healing those people afflicted by political night blindness and social myopia, M. Gorbachev began his speech at the Russian Communist Party Congress, it seemed to me, with a self-justification. "Has the leader really exhausted his potential, as some people claim, is he past it, so to speak?" I asked myself. Then it occurred to me: M. Gorbachev is deliberately avoiding confrontation, he is waiting for the CPSU Congress, where he will take up the challenge without fail. I discussed my ideas with a political scientist of my acquaintance. "No! You're wrong!" he declared bluntly. "The conservatives, of course, will not oust him, they will simply make him do what they want." "But won't it end up like the proverb," I answered him. "Hoist by their own petard."

It seems to me that I was right. M. Gorbachev's position has become stronger both in the party and the country. First, the general secretary is now elected by the congress. Second, part of the power, and a very large part at that, has been transferred from the Politburo to the Presidential Council. Third, the Politburo has gotten rid of the active conservatives. Its present composition is greatly preferable to the previous one. And the way congress delegates interrupted M. Gorbachev's closing speech with ovations and stood when it was over speaks volumes. M. Gorbachev won the skirmish with the conservatives. But... your assessments of the congress results will depend on whether you trust M. Gorbachev, whether you consider strong authority to be necessary in the transitional period, especially during the switch to market relations, when the aggravation of social tension is virtually inevitable, whether you realize that this strong authority must rely on some real political structures. And whether you agree that the two processes must proceed in parallel: On the one hand the appearance and strengthening of new democratic parties as a most important element of a pluralist political structure, and on the other the democratization and renewal of the CPSU as the most important factor for stability in this very complex period. A conservative CPSU, as it appeared before us at the two congresses, cannot be both a factor for revolutionary perestroyka and a factor for stability. If you agree with that, our assessments of the results of the 28th CPSU Congress' work must coincide.

M. Gorbachev is often criticized. From both the left and the right. Some accuse him of indecisiveness, others of haste. Some claim that he is incapable of going beyond the framework of pseudocommunist rhetoric, others accuse him of "apostasy," of betraying "principles," and of forgetting "values." But he goes his own way. He knows how to change in step with the politicization of society and the radicalization of the mass consciousness. That is the hallmark of a major politician. In the final analysis, M. Gorbachev proposed abolishing Article 6 of the constitution and the transition to market relations. And, it seems to me, he hasn't yet once acted as a brake on perestroyka. He really has pinned his future to it.

But nevertheless, how unjust we are to people! How often I have heard criticisms of M. Gorbachev both from the grain growers of my native Ukraine and from my Moscow colleagues: He often tours the country and goes abroad and all the time says the same thing. M. Gorbachev really does travel a lot, he meets with people, he explains to them the policy of perestroyka, he persuades people, and changes their mind. And it is this ability of his to convince people and to inspire in them a belief in the rightness of perestroyka and the sincerity of the Soviet leadership's intentions that does a lot of good, easing the implementation of the political course within the country and in the international arena.

During the 28th congress it occurred to me: Were it not for M. Gorbachev's ability to explain, to convince, and to change people's minds, it would hardly have been possible to achieve a breakthrough in the delegates' attitudes or steer the congress' work into a constructive course.

Is M. Gorbachev ideal, therefore? Of course not, and we are well aware of his shortcomings. He does not anticipate everything in good time. Sometimes he is slow to make decisions. Sometimes those decisions are half-hearted. Or not entirely consistent. I couldn't understand the leader's olympian calm during the elections of delegates to the congress, when the conservatives were exceptionally active. The infamous open letter helped them very much. What about the "Yeltsin syndrome"? The reaction to the Gdlyan and Ivanov provocations and so forth? I do not know. But just try to find a man with no shortcomings! Or something just as difficult, try to find a man capable of advancing perestroyka more skillfully than M. Gorbachev!

I believe that there are fresh skirmishes with the conservatives ahead of us. They, it seems, have no intention of laying down their arms. Thus M. Gorbachev will have a thousand and one more opportunities to show himself as a leader.

Unfortunately, the "slow hand-clapping" and "scuttling" are bound to affect the party's prestige. No matter what you do, as L. Abalkin said, "the scale of the failure to understand, ignorance, and low culture—they of course leave a very grave impression." We shall see how thoughtful communists react to this.

Will the party catch up with perestroyka? It certainly will not do so with the "whizz-kids" who predominated at the two congresses. But there are 18 million people in the party and it must promote the most capable and most modern-minded people to leading posts, to the forefront of the struggle for the revolutionary renewal of society. Only one thing can stop that—the selfish interests of those who want to preserve the administrative-edict system in the guise of socialism.

Details of AUCCTU Plenum Revealed

PM2407133190 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Jul 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "AUCCTU Plenum"]

[Text] The Ninth AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] Plenum took place in Moscow yesterday.

The following questions were placed on the plenum's agenda:

An organizational question.

On the draft Trade Union Action Program on Questions Associated With the Consequences of the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] Accident.

On the draft USSR Law "On Public Associations."

The plenum relieved G.I. Yanayev at his own request of the duties of AUCCTU chairman and AUCCTU Presidium member in connection with his election as a CPSU Central Committee secretary and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. The plenum expressed its gratitude to G.I. Yanayev for his work in Soviet trade unions.

The plenum adopted a decision not to elect the AUCCTU chairman before the 19th USSR Trade Union Congress, but to elect an AUCCTU deputy chairman. The right to participate in the election and in adopting decisions on questions on the agenda was granted, as well as to AUCCTU members, to AUCCTU candidate members, Central Auditing Commission members, and chairmen of trade union central committees and councils who are not members of central trade union bodies.

The candidates proposed for the post of AUCCTU deputy chairman were AUCCTU Presidium Members V.I. Goncharik, chairman of the Belorussian Republic Council of Trade Unions, AUCCTU Secretary V.M. Mishin, and V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of Moscow City Council of Trade Unions.

V.I. Goncharik withdrew his candidacy, giving as the reason for his decision the desire to concentrate for the moment on his work in the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

V.M. Mishin and V.P. Schcherbakov delivered an exposition of their positions on the fundamental problems of renewing the trade unions and of the strategy and tactics of their activities, and answered questions from participants in the plenum.

V.P. Shcherbakov was elected AUCCTU deputy chairman following a secret ballot.

AUCCTU Secretary G.F. Sukhoruchenkova delivered the report on the draft Trade Union Action Program on Questions Associated With the Consequences of the Chernobyl AES Accident.

The following spoke in the debate on the report: V.I. Goncharik, chairman of the Belorussian Republic Council of Trade Unions; V.D. Leskov, chairman of Gomel Oblast Council of Trade Unions; S.S. Yevtushenko, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Republic Council of Trade Unions; N.D. Pupkov, secretary of Mogilev Oblast Council of Trade Unions; L.I. Novak, chairman of the Medical Workers Union Central Committee; N.S. Bushkov, chairman of the Nuclear Power Engineering and Industry Workers Union Central Committee; V.A. Ivashutin, chairman of Bryansk Oblast Council of Trade Unions; V.Ye. Mozhayev, secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions; V.G. Lunev, chairman of the Coal Industry Workers Union Central Council; and N.R. Zhotabayev, chairman of Semipalatinsk Oblast Council of Trade Unions.

The plenum adopted a resolution "On the Trade Union Action Program on Questions Associated With the Consequences of the Chernobyl AES Accident for the Years 1991-1995."

The plenum adopted a resolution on the draft USSR Law "On Public Associations," and a Declaration on USSR Trade Unions' Property.

At this point the plenum's proceedings ended.

Ivashko, Dzasokhov, Others Discuss Party, Issues

LD2407091590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 23 July carries a 90-minute edition of the "Political Dialogues" program, introduced by Igor Fesunenko. Introducing this live program, Fesunenko notes that it marks the opening of a series entitled "Who's Who? Within the Political Dialogues Cycle." "In this rubric we shall be acquainting you with members of our country's new party leadership, and with prominent political and public figures in the Soviet Union," Fesunenko says.

Taking part in today's program are: Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Galina Vladimirovna Semenova, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Valentin Aleksandrovich Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During the program the participants will be responding to questions phoned in by viewers.

Fesunenko asks each of the guests to define their duties within the Politburo. Ivashko confirms that his job is to lead the work of the Secretariat: "Although for some time, for the time being at any rate, I shall have to involve myself with issues concerning the party's socio-economic policy." Dzasokhov says his general brief is ideology, a sphere which includes not just political issues, but also culture, the party press, the mass media, and party contacts with the artistic intelligentsia: "In brief, it is everything related to the humanitarian sphere of the party's activity." Semenova lays claim to "a completely new aspect of the party activity". It is based on the priority of common human values, and when we speak of common human values, these are primarily life, the family, the individual, the woman, and problems of the women's movement." Kuptsov's brief is links with sociopolitical organizations and various movements.

The guests are then asked to provide some detail on their career backgrounds. Semenova was a journalist and candidate of philosophical sciences, who worked in various positions with both papers and magazine, until she began her latest job with the magazine KRESTYANKA some years ago. She feels that her experience has given her a special awareness of the miseries encountered by Soviet women in their everyday lives.

Asked to speak about himself, Ivashko says: "I think my biography is a typical one for people of my generation. I was born in Poltava, on the outskirts of Poltava. My father was a worker and then an invalid. I studied at school and at an institute. Then it came about that I worked for 17 years at a higher educational institute in the city of Kharkov. I was professionally involved in questions of economics, and the organization of industrial production. That's how I was known. I have occupied various minor elected party posts—party group organizer in the faculty party organization, then secretary of the party committee.

In 1973, I was invited to work in the Kharkov Communist Party as head of the science department. Then I went on to become secretary of the oblast committee, secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Committee, second and then first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee. During recent months, very serious changes and conflicts have taken place in my life. I was elected chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Party Supreme Soviet. I decided to concentrate my activity there, and therefore requested not to be elected first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee again. But life has turned out in such a way that I thought that, in the interests of strengthening authority, and general attitudes to the new authority which is now being formed in the Soviet Union, it was better than I resign after a very short period of working in the Supreme Soviet. This was in no way connected with my election to the post of deputy general secretary of the Central Committee—it was absolutely unrelated in any way. Nevertheless, life took such a turn that I was elected at the ongress to this post, and I have to work."

Dzasokhov had a varied career; he worked in the youth movement, in diplomatic work. He worked in Cuba; he was an ambassador and AAPSO secretary. His initial education was technical, but he lated studied at the Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee.

Kuptsov was an engineer who came to Moscow from Vologda where had worked until recently as first secretary of the oblast committee. He became involved in primary party organizations at his metallurgical works and rose through the ranks.

Fesunenko then puts the first question to Ivashko: "Why couldn't this renewal of the Politburo, the Central Committee, raykoms, and obkoms, have been done five years ago?" The questioner, a geologist from Ukhta, believes that in this case perestroyka wouldn't have become bogged down and the current economic crisis wouldn't have come about. Ivashko answers:

"I don't understand very well why five years ago has been taken as the point of departure. I believe it would have been even better if this renewal had taken place earlier. I suppose that the developments of perestroyka

are very complex and give rise to very diverse approaches, opinions, and stratifications in society, and various currents within the party. They placed the demand precisely that people of the most diverse experience should come to the leadership of the Central Committee, people who have worked, as they say, in the localities, who have been in closer contacts with the party masses. Besides, the renewal of the Politburo is related to another process. You have probably noticed that our Politburo does not now contain any ministers or government leaders. You see, that is also a symptom which testifies to a change in the role and nature of party activity. This is what I think. As for renewal five years ago, in my opinion it would have been better to renew it 15 or 20 years ago. Then we would have had fewer problems today."

Valentina Grigoryevna Kondratyeva, an engineer from Moscow Oblast, asks: "Why are they sending our sons to Transcaucasia? Will it not turn out that in a few years time our armed intervention will again be acknowledged as a mistake?" Semenova voices understanding for the sentiments behind the question, but declares that the comparison is false: "Transcaucasia is our Soviet Union, and if the sons of acquaintances and friends of Valentina Grigoryevna are indeed suffering at present, it must also be taken into account that the sons of those women who live in Transcaucasia are also shedding blood and are suffering." This question needs to be considered further, and is to a large extent related to reform in the army and the internal troops.

"Should party committees be removed from enterprises?" Sidorenko from Zaporozhye asks. Kuptsov points out that the congress decided that this should not be done at present, although perestroyka is required at the party's grassroots.

Surikov, a pensioner from Moscow, wishes to know whether the prices of periodicals, papers, and magazines are to be increased in the new year. Dzasokhov stresses that "we cannot take steps which would restrict the scale of glasnost at present and its development in the future." It is primarily an economic matter, but the Politburo would recommend to the government that it bring about the "material preconditions, especially paper" so that the issue can be resolved. Ivashko interjects: "You know, this is one of the episodes that await us in large quantities in the future, as we transfer to the market. Interests have now clashed here—primarily those of the reader, the subscriber, the interests of the publishing house, the interests of the delivery service, and those of the printers. But evidently, to encroach upon glasnost, to encroach upon the interests of the reader, is not the best method of starting the market. Therefore during the short months that remain, it is appropriate to find compromise solutions, and the CPSU Central Committee intends to utilize its possibilities to their full extent in order to cut this knot. Perhaps it will not succeed in cutting it 100 percent, but in any case, we must bring these interests together."

Krasavin from Moscow asks a specific question of Ivashko: "What relation are you to Gorbachev, through his wife's family?" Ivashko says in reply: "Well, I have been related to very many political figures—in quotation marks, of course. I wish to stress, first of all, that I do not reject a single one of my relatives. My relatives—both those who are alive and those who are not—are my relatives; they are my near ones. But I would like to answer the question in this way: Neither Mikhail Sergeyevich nor his wife, nor anyone else in the city of Moscow, is a relative of mine. I have no relatives in Moscow."

A further question to Ivashko is from Blokhina, from Moscow: "Why do you allow Lenin to be insulted?" The answer: "I do not know whether she means me personally, or the processes that are taking place. I would answer this question as follows: I assume that irrespective of whatever personality Lenin represents, it is in general unworthy for any living person to insult the memory of another person, and especially a person who is recognized throughout the world as a thinker, a scientist, a philosopher, a revolutionary. I would say that I see no difference between those people who, shall we say, destroyed churches 40 or 50 years ago, and those who are today toppling monuments. You see, it makes no difference. These are simply immoral people. I ought to say that it is registered in the documents of the 28th congress that thee party and the CPSU Central Committee will do everything to defend the memory and the teaching of Lenin, having rid ourselves, of course, of the social distinctions which we used to have and which, unfortunately, contributed little to the memory of Vladimir Ilyich."

Veysberg from Sumy asks how the party's new priority of common human interests fits in with Marxist-Leninist teaching, which is based on the class struggle. Semenova asserts that there is no contradiction: "If we are speaking of the priority of common human values, then this is indeed the broadest platform, program, for specific assistance to people." Another caller asks why the party has now decided to devote attention to the women's movement: "We need a policy to harmonize attitudes in society, for without confirming women's worth, the family's priority in society, there will be a distortion in the harmony of general human relations. A society without women is, after all, like a bachelor's apartment—untidy and unpleasant," Semenova replied.

A number of callers ask whether other political parties will be offered the same opportunity to present their policies. Fesunenko says: "I wish to say that, of course, this program "Who's Who?" will subsequently tell you about prominent political, public figures and perhaps statesmen in our country, but we have begun, of course, with the CPSU, the leadership of the CPSU, because for the time being—everyone knows that Article Six of the Constitution has been rescinded—but the CPSU remains the most massive, the most organized, the most powerful—if I may use this word—political force in the country. No one can deny this." Ivashko interjects: "Igor

Sergeyevich, I don't quite agree with you. The point is that I have myself seen leaders of the anarcho- syndicalists speaking on television, and of another party of a social democratic bent, so there have already been programs of this type on Central Television, and very thorough and detailed ones." Fesunenko explains that he is speaking about this particular program, which might very possibly be open to other political parties. Dzasokhov points out that the CPSU is now committed by the documents of the 28th party congress to dialogue and cooperation with other political parties.

Kozlova from Zelenograd asks who will protect the president and general secretary from Novodvorskaya's attacks [Democratic Union chairman] Dzasokhov replies that the conscience of each citizen is entrusted with this task. "The head of state is a symbol of nationwide unity. It is a person who is invested with the highest degree of trust from the whole people."

Fesunenko reads a question to Ivashko: Do you think the 28th party congress has raised the party's prestige?

Ivashko says: "I cannot give a simple yes or no answer for the following reason. The 28th congress was a very serious event in our party's and country's life. These are not mere words of the kind we used to say 10 or 15 years ago. This is the truth. Let us recall the pre-congress atmosphere. There was talk about the party falling apart; there were vehement attacks I would say, from every quarter, both from the left and from the right. Let us recall the congress. After all, it did not folow a habitual path. If one now analyzes those days, one can see most varied episodes, sometimes very dramatic ones. And we saw clashes of opinions and sometimes heard opposite viewpoints. And I would ask both you and the viewers to take note of the following thing: Is there anything wrong in the fact that different viewpoints were voiced? In my opinion, if we want to proceed with perestroyka, we should simply look around ourselves in a new way. One cannot find two identically thinking people in the whole world. Like-mindedness is feasible regarding the main thing: principles. And the things that took place in such an auditorium freely and openly—well, I am omitting certain extremes which should be put down, frankly speaking, to the outright bad manners displayed by certain individuals, this is a totally different matter—those things are, after all, an achievement of perestroyka. One should pay attention now, however, not to who said what and in what way, but to what the congress has arrived at, at what documents. One should read our resolution on the political report and the political program statement, the new rules, and the resolutions. This is a totally new phenomenon in our party's life, at least in the last decade, which bears upon the main spheres of society's life. And whatever document one chooses, it shows that the party's policy is aiming ahead toward the democratization of society, the construction of a new society if you will, a new economy, a new spiritual sphere, and new relations between people. Not everybody understands this yet, and our task now, that of the Central Committee Secretariat and of the Central Committee in general, as I see it, consists precisely in making these most important achievements of the congress, which are embodied in its documents, available to each communist. The party is a living organism. An organism is healthy only when each one of its cells is alive. If a cell dies or does not function properly, the organism becomes sick. We must ensure that all communists become part of life, all those who make up our party. I see this as a pledge of success of our policy."

Semenova adds that the party is striving to become a party of civic concord, but a low level of political culture is often an obstacle. Constructive dialogue is now needed. Kuptsov reads a question about the way his department is going to supervise links with organizations since they are not recognizing the party any longer because the party has turned into a stinking corpse. In reply Kuptsov argues that the party is far from moribund; it will find resources for renewal and will continue to play a vanguard role in society. His department will analyze the political situation, will take part in all discussions, will defend the party interests, but at the same time, it will be prepared to cooperate with any social and political organizations adhering to the socialist choice, and be partners with all movements of democratic orientation. Kuptsov goes on to say that, in his view, other democratic organizations will agree to cooperate with the CPSU. Contacts have already been established with some organizations.

A question is then posed to all the participants: Why do we permit people like Popov or Sobchak to leave the party with a bang, whereas they should have been expelled from the party, thereby showing the people that they are not worthy to be in the party? Fesunenko adds that similar views were expressed at the congress, too. Ivashko remarks briefly that as he remembers, it was decided at the congress that primary party organizations should determine their attitude toward such acts. Dzasokhov says that, generally speaking, the party is absolutely for transferring power to the soviets. He argues that one should pay more attention to the reasons prompting people to leave the party. The number of those who have left the party is very insignificant, and the media, while commenting on this process, should not forget to mention that, at the same time, others are joining the party.

Ivashko says: "I would advise people to think twice before opting for such a step as leaving the party. We live in complex times. A great number of supplanted antiparty ideas is circulating in society. Incidentally, here is a note: Antonina Ivanovna Selezneva asks: There are rumors that part of the income tax will be allocated for bonuses to party workers. If this is so, on what grounds? Well, first of all, this is not true. This idea was planted on her and others on purpose in order to fan up the fire..." Fesunenko interrupts with "of unhealthy feelings." Ivashko continues: "A totally new atmosphere reigns in the party and the Central Committee. There are now possibilities for discussing, arguing, or defending views.

The composition itself of the Central Committee shows this. It includes representatives of the Democratic Platform, the Marxist Platform, and other trends. They are among the Central Committee today. So, if you wish this party well, do not leave it. If you wish to set up a new party or to simply leave, just in case, this is your right."

Aleksandrov, a CPSU veteran, asks why communists are now voluntarily surrendering power. Semenova says that "the fact that communists are surrendering a monopoly on power is a natural process within the logic of our progress towards a legal civilized state. It is in the interests of people." She refuses to give an appraisal of the activities of Novodvorskaya from the Democratic Union. It is up to the members of the Union, who have elected her, and the public. She quotes an article by Druzenko in the 22 July IZVESTIYA which calls for tolerance towards the new arrivals, like former dissidents, on the scene of power. At the same time, although some of them suffered in the past, they should refrain from revenge because it cannot be constructive, Semenova adds.

Fesunenko addresses Ivashko, summarizing numerous similar questions: "Why have you left the Ukraine? Does it mean that you gave in there and opted for Moscow for some career reasons?

Ivashko replies: "I have a heap of questions, the majority in the same vein, although there are people, in general, who have already understood that I have taken a position. As regards the career, I was leaving Kiev—incidentally, all my questions are from the Ukraine, one from Kishinev and the rest from Ukrainian viewers. They accuse me of not saying a word in the Ukraine. This does not correspond to the facts. My extensive statement was published and, besides, I had an approximately 40-minute long appearance on Ukrainian television after all those events. The question in point was the following: We have elected new bodies of power and we want to assert this power. You know, if I wanted a career and a quiet life, I simply would not stand for president of the Supreme Soviet in the first place. I was the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and I can assure you that nobody was going to fire me, putting it bluntly. I made my choice. Those who write these notes should have seen the things I had to go through. I had to answer not for myself, but for the whole party. I was spared only one accusation, that it was not me who destroyed the Tower of Babel. All the rest, everything for the past years and decides was imputed to me. I stood my ground in the struggle."

Ivashko continues: "Incidentally, many of those on whom I counted did not support me, although many people did. And when I was going to the congress in Moscow, I had absolutely no plans. All in all, I am speaking honestly, and moreover, I feel uneasy. After all, I am putting the general secretary in an ambiguous position. He did not know and did not have any proposals on my account until 6 July when I received information from Kiev on the events that had taken place in the Supreme Soviet and I was requested to come to Kiev immediately, without any grounds for that. Besides, this was preceded by various forces closing ranks, and several of my proposals were killed, so to speak, a week before. Various forces wanted to take the chairman of the Supreme Soviet in their hands in the Ukraine. And I thought: Do I have the right now to display any softness in this respect? No, I do not. If we are creating new power, a democratic society, a law-based state, this power must be respected, the people who represent this power should be respected, and, if you like, this work should be done jointly. I thought that, in the name of the chairmen of Soviets of the different levels, including the future chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, I must act, and I acted in a way that people did not expect me to. It has transpired now that those people who were outright against me are now, just as unreservedly condemning that act of mine. I think that after some time, people will understand that I did that thinking not about myself—because I did not have any work—but about power in the Ukraine and in the country in general, about an attitude toward it in the new conditions."

Fesunenko then reads a question from Vasiliy Fedorovich Ivanov from Reut. Do you have children and grandchildren, are they CPSU members and what material privileges do they enjoy, Ivanov asks?

Ivashko replies: "I have a wife, she is not in the party, in the last few years we have traveled together. My children live in another town and they do not move around with me. I worked in Kiev, Dnepropetrovsk, and now in Moscow and they will remain where they are. They work. What privileges do they enjoy? The same as all ordinary Soviet people, and that is all."

Fesunenko then asks: "They are not driven around in a Chayka?"

Ivashko replies: "No, not in any Chayka. I am not driven around in a Chayka myself either now or when I was first secretary of the Oblast Committee or the Central Committee."

Fesunenko continues: "This is hard to believe, but what can we do?"

Ivashko suggests: "Well, one can make enquiries in Kiev and Dnepropetrovsk, very simple."

Fesunenko goes on to ask: "And yet another question because you are from the Ukraine, a short question and a short answer. Vladimir Vasilyevich Osipov asks what republic the Crimea should belong to."

Ivashko responds: "I am categorically against any redrawing of borders, both external and internal."

Fesunenko interjects: "One should refrain from rubbing salt in the wounds."

Ivashko continues: "Listen, if one permits such a precedent, a great calamity will result. This is like pushing a

boulder down from a hill. Quite a few have already been pushed down, why add more? All in all, those who live in the Crimea and the Ukraine should decide."

Kuptsov is then asked to tackle a few of the questions that have been sent in. One Moscow woman wants to know how to go about joining the CPSU and what qualities are needed. Kuptsov advises her to go and see either her local party organization or her workplace organization. As for what qualities are required, Kuptsov says: "I believe today there is only one: The desire to struggle for renewal, within both society and the party." Another question asks why, given that the CPSU is a sociopolitical organization, the building housing an oblast party committee should be guarded by the KGB? Kuptsov replies that nowhere is this the case—it is an erroneous question.

Fesunenko then reads out another question from Comrade Vozhdizhinskiy in Moscow: Theoretically the party's objective is to combat private property, and of course to combat market-based relations. "If a party member today pronounces the word "market", then that party member ought to throw away his party card," the questioner states.

Kuptsov responds that this is an example of the old approach to things; people keep worrying that what is being done today is "not the communist way." As for what percentage of the national economy should be privately owned, Kuptsov says "in my opinion, let's say, there should be around 50 percent state ownership. Then the percentage that should be share-hold, cooperative, or private will clearly depend on the situation—on the degree to which market relations are approached."

Semenova breaks in to recall Engels, who said that man should first eat, sleep, and dress himself before he can think of ideas. Ivashko, too, chips in: "The fact of the matter is that the market means above all restructuring of the economy on totally new principles. The market cannot be declared; it must appear." Ivashko goes on to recap in simple terms what Ryzhkov said—according to yesterday's IZVESTIYA reprint of his speech—at the meeting of the Federation and Presidential Councils. "New links should now be created—the only links that can exist—horizontal ties between enterprises. That is one level. Only then will interest come into play. At the second level, a new banking system should be created. An independent system, which is not subordinate to anybody." The third level, he continues, is the state "which should regulate some of the relationships." Moving on, Ivashko says: "I have here some notes asking: how will the less well off strata of the population exist in these conditions? This is the function of the state: to help." Ivashko continues: "We talk about a regulated market—that is ridiculous. It's the same as talking about fatty oil!" But it has to be said so that people might understand that the state "will take upon itself the functions of protecting the less well-off, above all," he explains.

The next question is for Dzasokhov: If we talk about political freedom, then when will questions referring to present or past membership of the CPSU, visits abroad, relatives abroad, etc. be removed from all official forms? Dzasokhov agrees that the questions shold be removed to conform to our present understanding of freedom of the individual. These "mould-covered" instructions and forms should be reviewed he states.

Fesunenko then reads out a message from Olga Chervintseva to Ivashko, congratulating him on his election as deputy general secretary. Ivashko thanks her for the greetings.

Following this there is a question for Kuptsov: How does the party intend combating societies like Paymat. Kuptsov replies that there must always be dialogue with all societies and movements to elucidate what in their programs is acceptable to our society, and what is not.

The next question to Kuptsov is about whether other parties will have organizations at enterprises. He replies that, realistically, the anarco syndicalists and others do not have the workplace support they would need. Democratic Russia might. "It is possible that in time - I cannot say how long, but let's say in a year's time—there could be a second party committee at enterprise," Kuptsov suggests. Ivashko adds: "The paradox is that, on the one hand, I have not heard of a single movement that would describe itself as anti-democratic. They all insist that they are democratic. But at the same time, their instructions are to cath someone out, if you'll pardon the vulgarity. What sort of democracy is that? The way we see it is okay, a cell is set up of the Social Democratic Party or some other party. Now, let it get on and work! We will compete with it on the basis of ideas. Semenova makes the point that just as there is no monopoly on power, so there is no monopoly on democracy.

Following this exchange, Semenova disposes of a few questions on education, the family, and women's salaries. Kuptsov responds to a question on aid from rayon committees for farmers. Dzasokhov adds: "As I see it, the party's task is to spot examples of people who are making a contribution by specific deeds and conscientious labor within the framework of democratic development."

Moderator Fesunenko then reads a question submitted by Dr. Smelin from Kostroma: What are the planned attitudes toward the intelligentsia and is there a plan for the dictatorship of any class?

Dzasokhov responds: "Yes. Frankly speaking, when I was reconciling myself to my new duties, I found a moral comfort in the fact that I would have a mandate from the party to talk with our intelligentsia. And I would like to say that many new members of the Central Committee have long term links with our intelligentsia. When we speak of the party, we must say that it is a party to which our intelligentsia belongs, it is the conscience of our nation. So the very first task is to raise their trust and

interaction. There is in the new Central Committee, a large group of brilliant personalities representing our Soviet intelligentsia. And I hope that they will make their presence felt to the party and the people."

Fesunenko then asks the participants which sports they are interested in.

Following this, Kuptsov is asked about communist prospects, and about the existence of a constructive rather than an extremist opposition. He says that the editorial commission preparing the program will deal with the first matter; as for the second, he refers to an item in VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA about a planned political coalition (?of) the CPSU, whose congress is expected around October. This will be a real opposition, states Kuptsov.

Responding to a suggestion that the party leadership is divorced from people's real lives, Kuptsov denies this avidly: "I think the fate of each one of us is fully and completely connected with people's fates. We have all come from labor or creative or other collectives, and know life," he affirms. Ivashko back him up: "Why do people keep making me into the relative of some important political leader? Because somehow, some people can't understand how a barefoot lad from the back of Poltava, without any highly placed relatives, should have gotten here. How can we be divorced? Our children, our (?grandchildren) live there," Ivashko asserts.

Fesunenko then reassures viewers that all their questions will be handed to the guests, even if they can't be answered on the program. He goes on to put a question to Dzasakhov about the irresponsible behavior of former members of the Politburo. Dzasakhov says that the party has given its evaluation of the period of stagnation, and that moral norms should reign in the party. He then responds to a question about whether the name of the Communist Party should not be changed, since the construction of communism is now said to be utopian. It is not wrong to discuss this, but it is not an urgent question, says Dzasakhov. "In the end, it isn't a matter of the name. Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that if we were to take up this question now, on the (?crest) of this greatly over exaggerated criticism of the total party, in my opinion this would be seen as a reconsideration of the basic principles of the party itself and of our way of looking at the world," he concludes.

Ivashko says that some viewers feel they are not being forthright enough. "I would like to stress this: We must reflect. There is already quite a lot of fury and confrontation in society. And you know, we don't need anyone to add to confrontation, to slogans, to cruelty of any kind now. This makes not the slightest difference to someone's set of principles, to their principled approach, to their efficiency. I don't think we should be hitting out wildly. We've done a lot of hitting in the past decades, and nothing good came of it," Ivashko says.

Fesunenko then asks the guests to look through the questions again, and choose something to talk about briefly before the program ends. He proceeds to read out part of an interview with Ivashko published in the news bulletin GLASNOST, the supplement to IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS, saying that the important thing is to see the direction in which the party is moving. Fesunenko asks him to outline this direction.

Ivashko responds: "Not all directions, especially since you are giving very little time. And here I have this note that I had put aside for the end: What specific measures are now envisaged to restore the prestige of communists and the prestige of the party? This question was asked by Comrade Bosilivyy. I consider that the new Central Committee, the whole party, the congress delegates who were given the relevant tasks must now concentrate their attention on making the new charter work, so that it should seep into every pore of the party, and then we shall have the prerequisites for the second, very important, element of our party work: Implementing our social and economic policy. Sometimes people want to confuse us: The fact that we have abandoned administration, economic affairs, does not at all mean that we shall not conduct our social and economic policy, for a party that does not have such a policy is simply no good to anyone. So we have to raise the communists to fulfil the documents of the 28th congress. That is the main thing."

Dzashkov then interjects: "I would like to use this minute for this: At the congress, there was a lot of discussion on the foreign policy of the Soviet state, and the stand of the CPSU on international affairs. In this connection, I want to say that until very recently people commonly thought: Let's hope there's no war. Now we are already getting, or have gotten, away from the cold war. Our society has become an open one, and I hope that in the party we shall be active upholders of the idea that our internal and foreign policies should be interwoven, and should corespond to our national interests. And the most important thing is that every advance on the political level or on the military and political level should turn out to be an increase in the economic wellbeing of Soviet people."

Kuptsov goes on to call for stability in society, while Semenova says she has a note which quotes the Bible, and wishes them success. Semenova says they can learn wisdom from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, from literature, from their ancestors, and from the bible. She wishes the viewers happiness.

Fesunenko then repeats his promise to take into account the questions that there was no time to deal with in the program. He ends by reading out two more calls from listeners, one thanking the participants, the other calling on them to help Gorbachev to implement his plans for the wellbeing of the people.

Ex-KGB Major's Revelations Reported

PM2407155190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 p 2

[Article by special correspondent A. Ganelin: "We Met Like Spies... Even Though the Topic of Our Conversation Has Long Demanded Discussion in an Atmosphere of Glasnost"]

[Text] Dushanbe—We met like spies.

"Outside the library at 1000 hours. You'll see there a car with the following registration number," he said on the telephone.

I made my way to the rendezvous, and my mind was beset by some trivial idea, something along the lines of "We're being followed, let's change the pace." But why should I change my pace? And how do I detect if I am being "shadowed?" I remembered! You have to pretend to be looking at a store window, while actually using it as a mirror to check whether someone is trailing you. But in Dushanbe, just like in any Soviet city, anyone stopping to look at a store window immediately comes under suspicion.

...A man behind the car's wheel. Without a word, I offered my papers. He carefully examined them, holding them on his knees so that no passerby could see what he was looking at.

"Let's get out of town. We'll talk there," he said.

"I would like to ask...", I began.

He quietly warned me that it would be better not to ask anything while inside the car.

As a matter of fact, the man I was meeting was not a spy but a former operations officer of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] KGB—Major, Retired, Viktor Aleksandrovich Kolganov. The papers I showed him were a certificate from the editorial office and his own letter, in which Viktor Aleksandrovich explained why the republic KGB was unable to prevent and put an end to the mass disturbances in Dushanbe. He had promised to give more details about this during a face-to-face meeting.

To be honest, I could not quite understand the need for such a conspiratorial meeting. After all, Viktor Aleksandrovich had no intention of revealing any state secrets to me. But I did find out more details.

Kolganov told me that the republic KGB Chairman V. Petkel had summoned him that morning and advised him to cancel the meeting with the journalist or to hold the meeting in his presence. So much for losing touch. You must admit, their work is meticulous. They know everything. But where did they find out?

"Who in the editorial office knew about your trip?", Viktor Aleksandrovich asked. I replied that several persons did, but I was sure they had nothing to do with it.

"Could your telephone have been bugged?"

I found it hard to answer this question, but it was he, not I, who had spent almost 20 years working as an operations officer.

The first thing Viktor Aleksandrovich did was to show me his medical record card, to prove that he is not a psychopath. I was convinced. He then told me about himself.

He was born in 1949. In 1968, while serving in the Army, he volunteered to go to Czechoslovakia to perform his international duty. He performed it. After the Army, he approached the Tajik SSR KGB, asking for employment. He was taken on. In 1971 he enrolled in the Red Banner F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Higher KGB School under the USSR Council of Ministers. After graduation, he worked in the Tajik SSR KGB Investigations Subdivision. In 1981 he was posted as adviser to the Afghanistan (Northern Zone) Security Service Investigations Subdivision. After Afghanistan, he returned to the republic KGB.

"Are you not afraid to talk about the KGB after what happened to Major General O. Kalugin, who was busted and deprived of all awards?", I asked Viktor Aleksandrovich.

"If they stripped a general of his rank and pension, it would be that much easier to take everything away from me, a major. But I sent my letter to the editorial office well before the publication of the interview with Kalugin. Am I afraid? No. I lost my sense of fear during operations in Afghanistan."

...We were talking on the river bank. Nobody in sight. But every now and again Viktor Aleksandrovich cast an anxious glance around. No sooner had two guys come up to us and asked for a light, and Kolganov quietly warned me—better to get away from here.

Back on the road again. Once again he kept an eye on the rearview mirror. We kept silent. But I was thinking to myself: "Fine, he wrote a letter. Has the KGB nothing better to do than watching us? You could go mad if you thought that every single person asking for a light was an agent."

...As it happened, I found out on the same day that, even before I had arrived in Dushanbe, the KGB had telephoned one organization to find out whether I had arrived or was still in Moscow. They telephoned again on the day I arrived, but for some reason they were asking about two correspondents who had supposedly arrived incognito. They asked to be informed if something else transpired about such an arrival.

Therefore, Kolganov was right. They know. Could it be a simple coincidence? After all, I did work as own correspondent in Tajikistan, maybe they wanted to offer me material for an article? In the evening I received a personal telephone call from the KGB, asking me to call

by. Why? I was told that they had completed the investigation of several cases connected with the February events in Dushanbe, there was some material.

"Viktor Aleksandrovich, how did you leave the KGB?"

He told me that he had clashed with the leadership, and wrote his first application for discharge in 1988. Subsequently he filed two further applications prompted by his unwillingness to work in the KGB. They promised to transfer him, but did not. A bad personal appraisal report was written, there were differences with chiefs about the organization of operations activity. He filed a leave application but he had to work one extra week, and when he returned he was charged with having returned one day late and his one-shot money payment was reduced by one-half.

"I was indignant. I told them that I would travel to Moscow, to the USSR KGB, to file an appeal against unlawful actions. That was in December 1989.

"I returned to Dushanbe, but refused to report back for work until I had received an answer. On 12 February I was summoned by the deputy chief of the republic KGB Cadres Department who told me that the question of my discharge had been resolved. I was told in March that I had been discharged."

An ordinary clash altogether, something that could have happened even in a housing administration office.

...Viktor Aleksandrovich said something about injustices in the allocation of apartments and cars, told me how money was collected among staff officers to get gifts and greenbacks for some commission from Moscow so as to get it to forge the results of an inspection of military-physical training...

The inner workings of the secret services, you would think. Is this the reason why we roamed all over the city, like a couple of terrorists? Who has not properly welcomed visitors from the center and sent the off with gifts and greenbacks? When the whole country was busy writing exaggerated reports and showing off, what was the KGB to do?

"I left the KGB when I realized that, under the prevailing system of work, it was incapable of performing its functions for the protection of state security. If only the showing off had been restricted to matters of normative returns! You probably recall the widely publicized case of A. Davlyatov, an agent of bandit formations in Afghanistan. He deserted in Afghanistan, where he was recruited and sent back to us. Do you know how he was actually arrested? He himself turned up at the republic KGB, approached the sentry at the building's main entrance and said: 'I'm Davlyatov, I'm on the wanted list, I've come to give myself up.' The sentry replied that it was not up to him to make any decisions: 'Go to reception.' Davlyatov made his way there. The duty officer at reception told him that the office had closed to the public for the day and he should go to the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. Davlyatov obediently made his way to the militia. It was only there that criminal investigation officers thought of detaining him and handing him over to the KGB. So much for the republic KGB's famous combat readiness."

I asked Viktor Aleksandrovich whether he realized that I would be unable to verify this. Could anyone confirm it? Kolganov promised to put me in touch with people who would confirm his information. True enough, he did warn me: "They will show proof that they are staff officers of the organs, but they will not reveal their names. They're afraid."

How about me? Am I not afraid? I can imagine how all documents will be extracted from my personal "dossier." A "personal case" will be opened. Information gathered throughout the 35 years of my life will be carefully studied. No, what am I saying. They probably don't have such dossiers for each and every one. This is nothing but fabrication. And what can they actually do to me? Plant dope on me?

"You're being trivial," Viktor Aleksandrovich explained. "They usually try to discredit the sources of information or the information itself. As far as you personally are concerned, they would try to prove that you, as journalist, juggled with the facts and presented unobjective information in your article."

Maybe trivial, I thought, but now I always try to be on my guard. A friend invites me to a wedding. At a restaurant? I firmly refuse. I never go out in the street at night. During the day, every passerby who follows me for more than 10 meters along the street seems to be one of the KGB's men. I hide the cassettes with the recording of my conversation with Kolganov at the correspondent's office, which is rather short of hiding places. I shift the cassettes from one place to another every day. Now I realize how dissidents must have felt in the seventies, for example. On the first day I felt that there was no "tail" behind me. On the third day I realized that we are all under the shadow of the tail of fear going back to 1937.

Unlike Viktor Aleksandrovich Kolganov, I never was in Afghanistan. Unlike him, when asked "Are you not afraid?", I cannot answer: "I lost my sense of fear during operations." But I am fed up with being afraid. And if, back in the eighties, we had not been afraid of one another and of that selfsame KGB, there may not have been any operations in Afghanistan.

...On Sunday I received another call from the KGB, asking for the editorial office telex number. Why? I was told that they had held a discussion on O. Kalugin's interview and wanted to send some copy to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. It seems to me, however, that there was more to that telephone call...

"After the February pogroms in Dushanbe, I realized that the party and the KGB had abandoned the people to the mob's mercy. At the beginning of the events, all staffers were concentrated in the KGB building, armed

with pistols, automatic weapons, machine guns, and even grenade launchers. The building was surrounded by infantry combat vehicles and armored personnel carriers under the pretext of protecting important documents. The organs' basic task is to protect the state and the life of all citizens, yet citizens were abandoned to their fate. Further pogroms were prevented only by the creation of citizens' self-defense detachments. I myself joined one of them."

Kolganov is a complex individual: He seems to be "slamming" his former employers, but he suddenly calls for the KGB to be better equipped:

"No way am I against the KGB. Any country, regardless of its system, needs security organs. I am in favor of the KGB, provided that it actually can perform its functions for the protection of state security. You know, between ourselves we often speak of the KGB as the Committee of State Poverty. You have Kalugin saying that we are given as much as we ask. But this is probably for work abroad. Inside the country we are destitute. Believe me, the rumors about the KGB's might are grossly exaggerated. They want to achieve results by building up staff numbers and the number of local organs. But what use is a staff member who does not even have transportation?"

"But you have such a quantity of informers who report everything about everybody. Do you mean to say that the KGB knew nothing about the impending pogroms?"

"It is a myth that the KGB knows everything about everybody. The committee has always focused its attention on ethnic conflicts. So why do they happen regardless? Let me tell you. Even though information about impending events in Dushanbe had been received, it was not properly evaluated. Nobody analyzed it. The CIA gives tremendous attention primarily to information analysis, but our analytical work is still at the Stone Age level.

"Back on 11 September 1989 I received information about the creation of a national youth organization in the republic, and it was possible to estimate what to expect. But this information was ignored. Another important item of information arrived just before the pogroms, but it was held back by the deputy chief of a Tajik SSR KGB subdivision. He did not consider it important and did not report to the leadership."

"Was the republic KGB in a position to prevent the pogroms?"

"Of course. The methodology for preventing and putting a stop to mass disorders was elaborated a long time ago. There are regular KGB and MVD exercises, there are plans which lay down everything as to who should be doing what. The plans have their code names, but I cannot talk about them because they all are classified 'top secret.' Let me say just this, leaders of KGB and MVD subdivisions countersigned these plans without studying their contents, sending their subordinates to exercises instead of going themselves. There is a list of actions the KGB and MVD can take to put an end to mass disorders, but they were not taken. Back in 1989, some people from the USSR KGB came to one of our conferences, and I said then that the KGB proved its unpreparedness in Fergana. Having studied the events which occurred in Tajikistan, in Isfar and Asht, I said that the republic KGB is not prepared for action in emergency conditions."

...A report attributed to the Tajik News Agency appeared in the republic newspapers 13 July. It was entitled "For Pluralism and Glasnost." It said that a general meeting of republic KGB staffers was held 6 July, which indignantly condemned O. Kalugin's actions to discredit the state security organs.

"Chekists resolutely rejected O. Kalugin's claims about the practice of political assassinations, universal political surveillance, the KGB's penetration of all pores of Soviet society, and the lack of perestroyka in state security organs...

"Under the influence of similar insinuations, picked up by some mass media in the quest for sensationalism, sundry 'aggrieved' and 'persecuted' persons have come up to the surface, including former KGB staffers...

"It has become known that Maj. V.A. Kolganov, who was discharged from the state security organs last March for service incompatibility, intends to use KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for yet another outpour of dirt against Chekists. This officer, having refused to report for work and having abandoned his comrades during the difficult days of mass disorders in Dushanbe, is now trying to redress the grievance for his failed careerist ambitions by retaliating against committee staffers, following the path which was laid by O. Kalugin and others of his ilk." This selfsame item was also received over our editorial office teleprinter.

Following the interview with Kalugin, the USSR KGB announced that he had been a poor worker, and his moral-political qualities were not up to a standard enabling him to talk about the KGB, let alone to criticize the committee. It was not hard to imagine that exactly the same would be written about Kolganov. And yet... After all, nobody claims that he was a shockworker on the invisible front. Nobody is pulling strings to get him the title of Honorary Chekist. The man simply wants to state facts. And nobody can say that facts have substandard moral-political qualities.

It is all well and good that Tajikistan's Chekists are in favor of pluralism and glasnost. So am I. But I must admit that I have not written everything that Maj. Kolganov narrated. He also narrated a series of other facts. Kolganov suggested that I personally conduct a certain amount of operations work to convince myself of their veracity. But I am no operations officer. I have not graduated from either a higher or a lower KGB school. Let him tell all this himself to a commission which would verify everything he says. As long as it is not a USSR

KGB departmental commission, but a commission including also USSR people's deputies.

...Prior to my departure for Moscow I called at the KOMSOMOLETS TADZHIKISTANA editorial office, where I have known everyone for almost five years, in order to have my official travel document validated. I was told there: "We recently received an article disputing your own item entitled 'If Fires Were to Start...'" Written by a chief of department at the Tajik Komsomol [Lenin Communist Youth League] Central Committee.

I am also in favor of pluralism. But I am still plagued by the thought: Why was this article delivered to the editorial office shortly before my arrival and almost four months after the "Fires" was published. I asked the author whether it was his own initiative or if the article was commissioned by someone. He most solemnly swears that he acted alone. He simply pondered it a long time.

I feel somewhat ashamed, this really might be yet another coincidence.

But I still would very much like to know: How was it found out that Maj. V. Kolganov "intends to use KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for yet another outpour of dirt against Chekists?" Sh. Dzhabirov, secretary of the Tajik SSR KGB party committee, explained that he found this out from republic KGB Chairman V. Petkel, who was told about it by Kolganov himself. So why did Kolganov secretly send his letter to the editorial office from the Moscow region rather than from Dushanbe? Could it be so that he could afterwards admit that he intends to use KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for an outpour of dirt? Why was the report "For Pluralism and Glasnost" released through TADZHIKTA even before the item about Kolganov appeared? Could it be in order to discredit the source of information and the information itself?

They tried to stop Kalugin. Kolganov appeared. A major general was busted, a major appeared. He will be busted. A colonel or a captain will appear. Once again, I'm sure, a former KGB staffer. Retired. Once again they will try to prove that he was a poor Chekist. And yet, in my view, those currently employed do not offer direct and clear-cut answers to questions about the KGB's activity, the numerous questions which society would like to ask. No, not only about successes in the struggle against smugglers and racketeers but also about political surveillance and dossiers on citizens. And about the reason why the KGB is unable to prevent pogroms which, as we are told on every occasion, are not spontaneous but organized...

For some unknown reason, however, only the retired ones take it upon themselves to answer.

Patriarch Warns Against Social 'Anarchy'

PM1907145190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jul 90 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with Patriarch Aleksiy by Viktor Gerasimov in Leningrad; date not given: "Preserve the Sacred Gift of Life. The Most Holy Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Aleksiy Speaks to Your PRAVDA Correspondent"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] The program for the first visit to Leningrad by the new head of the Russian Orthodox Church was being concluded when I decided to ring him and ask him to meet me. I must admit that he did not give me much hope: His Holiness' stay in the city was extremely busy.

"All right then," I heard the patriarch's friendly voice at the other end of the line as soon as I had made the request. "I would be glad to talk to a PRAVDA journalist, you are welcome! Tomorrow, say, at eleven." [passage omitted]

[Gerasimov] Many people are now setting their hopes on a rapprochement between church and state, cooperation between them, or at least noninterference on the part of state institutions in matters of faith. As a USSR people's deputy and a member of the Supreme Soviet Legislative Commission, you are participating in the elaboration of a new Law on Freedom of Conscience. Will it be adopted soon?

[Aleksiy] Work has not yet been concluded: Of course, delay is undesirable here, but haste may turn out to be inappropriate. The ecclesiastical council has expressed a number of valid observations even on the latest version of the draft, which I hope will be taken into account, as well as the wishes of other churches and religious associations. The law should not only give the church legal rights, but it should also open up possibilities for its social activity and participation in the spiritual and moral renewal of society, which will be to society's greater benefit. Could this make things worse for anybody?

Let us turn to Russian history. Alms houses, poorhouses, and orphanages were traditionally created at churches, where children who were deprived of parental love would receive an education, and there were Sunday schools. May such forms of activity again return to the church.

We are not cherishing illusions that everything will change straight away. Many problems are arising, including organizational, ethical, and material problems. But we must not be afraid of them—all complex problems an be resolved through faith, action, and diligent work. We must not just remain idle and waste time to no purpose—time is irretrievable.

We have already opened Sunday schools at many churches. Not just the children, but also interested parents can learn about the basics of Christian faith and morality there. People's gaze is turning more frequently

to the holy scripture and to our mother the church. It is the keeper of the permanent spiritual values which it has carried through the ages. [passage omitted]

[Gerasimov] By coincidence, we are having our conversation during the constituent congress of the Russian Communist Party, and today it has become good form to blame communism for all misfortunes. Direct calls for reprisals against them are being voiced at rallies. Forgive me, Your Holiness, what I would like to ask you is—is it right to pump up such anticommunist feelings and persistently form ideas of the party's general guilt in public opinion, and create a picture of a kind of enemy of the people made up of many millions of individuals?

[Aleksiy] I do not share such opinions. During many years of pastoral work I have often had to meet with rank and file communists and so-called apparatchiks of various ranks. Should we consider them all to be responsible for the distortions of socialism, the repressions, and the violation of human rights which we recently found out about, and for what is happening in the country today? I will not commit the sin of thinking that way. The people I knew and still know worked honestly. They were indignant when they found out about the abuses committed by the powers that be. They cared about their good name. Some people decided on open protest, for which they paid a high price. The majority sincerely lost their way—the cunning system of deceit obscured their sight and reason and kept them in fear and ignorance about the true state of affairs. As you know, servants of the church also had to drink the bitter cup to the dregs.

Deformations in the mass conscience were apparently formed a very long time ago, perhaps at the outset, like a delayed action mine. It seems that Plekhanov, assessing the situation in Russia at the beginning of the century, warned Lenin on the eve of the October events that the millstones of history had not yet ground the flour so that the pie of socialism could be baked. In other words, at that time the country had not taken the path of development that was objectively needed for a radical restructuring of social relations.

This built up, and the belittled forces of good did not have the strength to withstand it. The explosion has occurred in our times. The explosion was directed at the party: It is now being blamed for all errors, even the ones it had nothing to do with.

History cannot be rewritten, as we know. But I think that society would be developing differently if the decree on separating the church from the state and the church from schools had not been one of the first to be adopted by the Soviet authorities. In any event we would have managed to avoid the large-scale moral losses that are so difficult to compensate.

Having rejected and condemned what was bad in the past, I believe that today it is important for everyone to join forces and seek a way out of the impasse, instead of moving away toward confrontation and differences and then into the gloom of uncertainty. Our sick society, formed amid an authoritarian, one-party system, is standing on the threshold of a multiparty system. And this may create new difficulties and reinforce political differences of opinion even within the Communist Party itself. Will the voice of reason and common sense prevail amid the raging passions and contradictions? I very much hope and pray for that.

I see it as a good omen that M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin have found the strength to overcome personal resentment and have taken a step of reconciliation toward one another. The holy church blesses this peacemaking act on the part of two worthy men. May their example be a lesson to us.

Now that we have destroyed the enemy image in relations with other countries, it is time to stop looking for foes in our own fatherland, to stop trying to divide our country into parts. Our fatherland does not need shocks. People are tired of disturbances and discord. They have a right to expect accord and peace.

[Gerasimov] Glasnost, democracy, pluralism... These words are now firmly established in the vocabulary of perestroyka. How do you interpret them yourself?

[Aleksiy] It seems to me that people have turned out to be unprepared to interpret these ideas correctly. Sometimes people, including journalists, speculate in them to very unworthy ends. So glasnost is sometimes expressed as an insult to those who think differently. To please the crowd, unimportant biographical facts and weaknesses are brought out which are not even mentionable in respectable company. Frank conjectures, tendentious assessments, and deliberate distortion of the truth are not so rare either.

Democracy has unfortunately been understood even by some very intelligent people as a reason to put forward groundless demands, to talk excessively and work little, and to be more willing to destroy what came before than to create something themselves.

Pluralism is being used as an "irrefutable" argument for propagating even absurd ideas, if only to be noticed by the public and attract attention to one's person. An observation made by the sage Seneca, to the effect that a speaker's actions are more convincing than his words, inevitably come to mind. And alas, there are not many actions in evidence at the moment.

Let us hope that the USSR Supreme Soviet's intensive lawmaking activity will place these natural processes into reasonable frameworks. Not restricting civil freedoms, but nurturing a responsible attitude toward descriptions and images of actions among people. No civilized state can allow an absolute degree of freedom, if it doesn't want to find itself plunged into the chaos of anarchy.

[Gerasimov] And all the same, I will take the liberty of returning to the question of the Communist Party and its ideology. It seems to me that in a form purified of

dogmatic clutter it would not contradict Christian dogma. Even the "Moral Code of the Builder of Communism," which has imperceptibly fallen into disuse, coincides with the Biblical commandments.

[Aleksiy] That is not surprising. The whole of European civilization has evolved on Christian moral principles. Communist ideology also interpreted it, taking a great deal from the New Testament. The Reverend Hewlett Johnson, dean of Canterbury Cathedral, published the book "Christians and Communism" in the 1950's, where he made an attempt to syncretize religious dogma and the political direction of social thought. It is possible that we would not have witnessed to such depressing results if the victorious proletariat had not declared that its ideology was incompatible with religion during the first postrevolutionary years. It seems to me that that is where one of the tragic mistakes was made. [passage omitted]

Soviet Study of Ethno-Politics Discussed

90US1148A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian
No 26, Jun 90 pp 6, 7

[Report on interview with Doctor of Historical Sciences Mikhail Guboglo, leader of the Center for the Study of Inter-Nation Relations, conducted by Marat Abdullayev; place and date not given: "What Is Meant by Ethno-Politics?"]

[Text] [Abdullayev] Mikhail Nikolayevich, however obvious the answer to the question raised in the title might seem—ethno-politics has, after all, long been firmly established in many states as a social science discipline—we are still forced to ask this question. Primarily, we probably will not ascertain for ourselves the meaning and significance of this term. Still, it is important for us to determine the kind of national-political situation we are in inasmuch as it is clear to everyone that the former political unity, albeit something of a sham in recent years, has come to be replaced by political pluralism, the roots of which are probably largely fed by our country's national diversity.

[Guboglo] Truly, the correlation of national, social, and cultural diversity with the political unity that existed in pre-perestroyka times collapsed together with the rejected Article 6 of the Constitution and became a part of history and a thing of our past. However, it would be a mistake to believe that the multilateral and multifaceted pluralism unfolding before our very eyes is exhausted merely by the new diversity of political and politicized forces and currents. You have felicitously observed that the roots of political pluralism are largely nurtured by our country's national diversity. In addition, we are observing the close interconnection and active interaction of political and national factors, which, incidentally, is plunging many specialists and people in the field of national problems and inter-nation relations directly into a state of shock. After all, we are proving incapable not only of understanding the content, essence, and trends of the new national-political processes driving the national-political situation from one state to another, we are not opportunely and properly recording even the course of events and salient features of the present "inter-nation world," which is sensitive to change and not always stable. All this requires a certain experience. But where could this have been acquired if political pluralism is springing up and taking hold only now, before our eyes, and the heavy curtain over the stage of the interaction of national and political forces is still only half-raised....

[Abdullayev] So, as in other spheres of our life also, we were unprepared here for the sudden changes. Were we caught unaware yet again?

[Guboglo] Not entirely. There is, for all that, some base for the study of the current national-political situation in the USSR. If one looks through our periodical press, which has published material on the solution of national and inter-nation problems overseas (in African countries, Southeast Asia and in Latin America, say), it is easy to observe that together with the ethnological, ethnocultural and ethno-demographic situations the ethnopolitical situation in these countries has been studied also. Mention may be made here of a number of articles in the journal SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA and, particularly, in the annual "Races and Peoples," where this "ethno-political situation" concept, not all that familiar to many people, is even a part of the title. Of course, despite the somewhat one-sided development of Soviet ethno-politics, realized chiefly on the basis of foreign material, it is possible to use its experience as a basis today inasmuch as ethno-political situations and conflicts and their preconditions are typologically similar, and there is no need to reinvent the wheel.

The experience of domestic ethno-sociology, which emerged in the 1970's, could constitute a second source of methodological prerequisite for the formation of Soviet ethno-politics. True, it was devoid of any political thrust. In addition, neither ethno-sociologists, nor social anthropologists, nor ethno-demographers, nor other specialists working at the intersection of scientific disciplines were able to predict the shift of the ethnic into the sphere of social movements, into the sphere of politics and general democratic trends. Nonetheless, the material, research methods, information base, and conclusions which they produced could serve our future ethnopolitical scientists well.

[Abdullayev] In this case, Mikhail Nikolayevich, it is most likely possible to be more specific about Soviet ethno-politics?

[Guboglo] Unfortunately, so far we can speak of the definition of the contour boundaries of a new subject sphere and the preliminary distinction of its basic component parts. I see four spheres of fundamental problems here. First, the distinction and characterization of the components of the ethno-political situation: For example, people's fronts, including those fighting to convert the Union republics into sovereign states, for an increase in the authority of the autonomous republics

and for restoration of the former ethno-political status; intermovements which have arisen in response to the activity of the people's fronts; democratic movements of national minorities laying claim to the solution of questions of self-determination and national revival with the aid of territorial-political autonomy; and, finally, national-cultural societies (centers, clubs, national groups, and associations) oriented also toward national revival, but outside of any ethno-political packaging. Second, the ascertainment and analysis of the problems arising during the development and interaction of components of the ethno-political situation with the external ecology—that is, with the macro- and micro-environment—with the existing formal structures included: for example, factors, mechanisms and forms of the formation of ethno-political identification and marginalization; the emergence and resolution of interethnic conflicts (which may in the future, most likely, be separated into independent conflict studies); and the set of problems linking the mutual relations of the leaders and formal and informal movements and problems of the statization of various aspects of national policy, including the legitimization of linguistic life.

Third, the creation of an entirely new information base incorporating documents (programs, rules, standing orders, appeals, slogans, and so forth) born of perestroyka and the national and political movements, and updated statistics, including additional (in-depth) data of population censuses, new and follow up ethno-sociological mass polls, combined with limited monitoring with the participation of a relatively small group of specialists, and the avalanche-like data of the periodicals.

Fourth, what is required is an unambiguous "choice of path"—that is, the determination of precise approaches to the study of the ethno-political situation, including consideration of the ethno-territorial and ethno-economic aspects of the environment, the level of its infrastructure, the ethno-demographic and ethno-social parameters of the components of the ethno-political situation, the ethno-cultural, ethno-linguistic, and ethno-personality characteristics of the participants in the movements, the ethno- historical and ethno-legal conditions of the formation and functioning of the ethno-political situation and its transition to a different quality, and, finally, historiography and the conceptual-terminological aspect, which are obligatory for any independent scientific discipline. Work is being completed in our center on preparation of the concise "Peoples of the USSR" ethnographic dictionary. Work has begun on an ethno-political dictionary, and it is time to be thinking about ethno-geographic and ethno-demographic dictionaries. What the sprouts in each sphere will be, time will tell. It is perfectly obvious, however, that a central topic of ethno-political research should be connected with the study of the current national movements in our country. There is an immense amount of work to be done here. The point being that the outwardly similar screen of the people's fronts conceals at times far from identical aims and aspirations. No one has yet come forward with a typology of these movements from the viewpoint of where, in what direction, the scale is being outbalanced in each of them.

The intermovements, which have arisen as a counterweight to the people's fronts, have been illustrated extremely one-sidedly (mainly in the periodical press).

And the movements of national minorities? I would like to ask you: What do you know about them?

[Abdullayev] Merely that they exist. As some third component, third force on the national-political stage. Together, of course, with the people's fronts and intermovements which you have mentioned. But how many such movements there are and what their orientation is—merely national-cultural or national-political—this is not known as yet. True, the "Gagauz Khalky" movement of Gagauz is mentioned quite often, and I can recall a further five or six—in Adygey, for example, in Dagestan or in Uzbekistan....

[Guboglo] This is why I would like to say to you that there has generally been inadequate study of the problems of national minorities, not to mention any of their movements. We have pursued a very odd policy toward them. When one ponders it more deeply, one inevitably concludes that some de-ethnization of minorities and artificial prompting of them toward total assimilation was evidently contemplated in the 1930's. Think about it: The fewer the national groups, the fewer the difficulties on the ethno-political stage and the easier it is to administer a vast country. The "father of the peoples" understood this, it would seem.

[Abdullayev] Could you buttress your conclusions in any way?

[Guboglo] Please note, the 1926 population census recorded 188 ethnic designations in our country. Ten years later, in 1936, Stalin "reduced" this overall number in his report on the draft new constitution to 63—which was "confirmed" by the 1939 census. The "reduction" occurred at the expense of the national minorities, naturally. As of 1939 they did not, as it were, exist. And although the postwar censuses raised the number of ethnic designations to 101, this has not saved the situation. An example of this is the last census, of 1989, which promised to extend the list to 128 designations, whereas it really is not less than 150-160. I am sure that in this new census we will not find, for example, Latgals, Ingermanlanders, Vody, and a number of peoples of the mountain areas of Tajikistan. I am sure that in the general "Tatars" column there will be different ethnic groups of Tatars—Volga, Tyumen, Astrakhan, Barabinsk, Tobolsk, Zabolotnyye, Siberian, Chulym, Misharey, Kryashen, and others. Of course, here we may speak both of methodological imperfections in the organization of the census and of the fact that each new line in processable census data costs millions of rubles. But these are rather the consequences of the blows inflicted in the 1930's. And I shall say nothing about another

problem, when, fearing punitive measures, as a result of collectivization and other social upheavals, and sometimes as directed, many representatives of national minorities were forced to "change" nationality.

[Abdullayev] How do you evaluate the role of national minorities on the ethno-political stage? How great is their influence on the climate in inter-nation relations?

[Guboglo] You see, Europe has distinctly recognized the simple regularity that the attitude toward national minorities is largely predetermined by the stability of society and the state of the national-political atmosphere. And, the reverse: The sturdiness of socioeconomic reality depends on the status and position of the national minorities.

Take present-day Europe. The consolidation of the German people from two states on one shore, the deconsolidation of the Soviet people (as an ethno-political community) on the other, and the exposed Lithuanian nerve between them are creating such discomfort for the small European states and for the national minorities that it is becoming uncomfortable for all—large and small. And it is perfectly natural that the understanding of the key role of minorities in the creation of one climate or another of inter-nation relations has brought sober-minded politicians and theorists to the idea of the preemptive elaboration of legal safeguards of the status of national minorities in multinational states of the modern world. Hungary's initiative pertaining to the preparation and extensive discussion in April 1990 of a number of legal documents on minority rights—"Model Charter of the Self-Government of Minorities"; "National, Ethnic, and Linguistic Minorities (Minorities Code)"; and others—has, in particular, elicited extensive public comment. The fact that many of the world's leading experts on problems of national minorities have responded to the appeal of Hungary's scholars and public figures testifies to the profound concern for the position of minorities and the additional threat to their status emanating from the direction of a possible revision of the results of World War II. So it is hard to exaggerate their significance. Incidentally, no more and no less than approximately 60 million persons belong to minorities in our country. This is a tremendous force on the ethno-political stage.

[Abdullayev] So we have touched on the main "objects," so to speak, of ethno-political research—people's fronts, intermovements, and movements of national minorities....

[Guboglo] But I would pay particular attention also to movements of a national-cultural orientation—entirely new public movements, incidentally. Here also everything is far from simple. Although the majority of these movements is geared to the creation of conditions for the preservation of national distinctiveness and optimization of the processes of national revival, there are in their ideology, program principles, and forms of organization many nonconcurrent features, about which it is important to know also. But this is the case, incidentally, inasmuch as the subject sphere of ethno-political research is far wider than and is not confined merely to the study of national movements and fronts. Interethnic conflicts may be attributed to the objects of the close attention of ethno-politics. Specifically, we are faced with a careful analysis of many of their preconditions. And not only the classical preconditions conscientiously described by foreign scientists on the basis of examples in many parts of the world but also our own, homegrown preconditions, so to speak.

I will go further. We will have to accustom ourselves to the surprise idea that we need conflicts as forms of ascertaining and overcoming contradictions in internation relations and an understanding of conflicts as desirable boosters or catalysts of social progress. One further paradoxical truth, toward whose discovery we are progressing, is the fact that the pluralism and manysidedness which have rained down on us are not only illuminating the ethno-political stage but also, in creating a competitive situation, are mobilizing additional potential in the search for the optimum and efficient solutions.

From here, in turn, flows the extraordinarily important expectation of ethno-politics: We will expect from it answers to the questions as to who needs conflicts and why in order to subsequently think about how and in what forms and with whose help to avoid extremism and how to seek parliamentary and legal forms to channel the energy of conflicts onto the path of constructive solutions.

[Abdullayev] It is now understandable, Mikhail Nikolayevich, why you pose so seriously the question of the need to study the deputy corps of our new leaders and their advancement by the hidden elevators of our sociopolitical pyramid.

[Guboglo] Leaders of national movements are in the sphere of interests of ethno-politics. This is a very important issue. We have insufficient knowledge of leaders in general—political, ethnic, leaders of formal and informal structures; real and imaginary, leaders as delegates, as representatives of their environment; and leaders as architects of the current ethno-political situation. Is this not why our ideas concerning the ethnopolitical situation itself and the nature of inter-nation relations are flawed, incomplete, and, at times, inaccurate also? Yet in the West there is a colossal amount of literature on the ethnic leaders there, which presents their biographies, their emotional and intellectual potential, their political slogans, the correspondence of word and deed, and so on and so forth. Of course, the study of the biographies, ideas, ideological platforms, and activity of leaders is not an end in itself but a component of the direction of ethno-politics within whose framework the formation of our new structures and the evolution, course, and results of election campaigns are studied, and a content analysis of the platforms and

programs of the candidates for deputy and candidates for ethnic or political leaders is made.

[Abdullayev] Therefore, Mikhail Nikolayevich, to speak of our ethno-politics as a whole, we have, first, a base for its formation; second, if only in general outline, an objective sphere of its research. It remains to answer the main question: How do we create the new sources and new information base, and on whom and on what are future experts intending to rely?

[Guboglo] This is, indeed, the main question. There is a shortage primarily of the "builders" themselves. And the sources and information are, figuratively speaking, the infrastructure without which embarking on the creation of the edifice of ethno-politics itself is impossible. And these sources exist. It is necessary to carefully collect them and skillfully manage them. Specifically, the first digest on Latvia from a new series planned by the USSR Academy of Sciences Center for the Study of Inter-Nation Relations has already been published. Similar digests with a selection of programs, statutes, declarations, and appeals published in the local press have been prepared for publication on Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Lithuania, and Moldavia. Work is continuing on the collection of documents pertaining to other republics.

One further new type of source engendered thanks to perestroyka and glasnost is the material of the periodical press, which has rained down an avalanche of articles on questions of inter-nation relations. They also require some systematized approach, in the form of the publication of a series of newssheets, perhaps. But it is opportune to send out an SOS here: The center as yet lacks the premises, the resources, and its own printing facilities.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize that however rich the theoretical, conceptual experience of foreign ethno-politics regarding a comprehensive analysis of the conditions and factors of the origin and development of ethnic movements and their interaction with actual political organizations and parties, it should be borne in mind that all decisions concerning specific problems, forms, paths, methods, and mechanisms for the satisfaction of individual, group, and statewide interests and requirements may be proposed only on the basis of a painstaking empirical study of actual reality and the actual conditions of the macro- and micro-level. Affirmation of the principles of the new thinking and its introduction in the practice of national-political research is an important task of ethno-politics, and without accomplishing this we will not be in a position to overcome the present crisis in the sphere of inter- nation relations.

FROM THE EDITORS: Our weekly has already acquainted readers with certain national movements in a number of republics of the country. However, considering the entire seriousness of the problem outlined in the interview published above, we plan, in subsequent issues of SOYUZ, to publish more detailed information about the characters and movements which have come onto the ethno-political stage of the USSR.

Legalities of Property Distribution Examined

90UN2192A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with Professor V. Martemyanov, doctor of legal sciences and chief of the Economic Law Section of the All-Union Correspondence Institute of Law, and A. Maslyayev, doctor of legal sciences and professor of the Civil Law Section of the All-Union Correspondence Institute of Law, by unidentified PRAVDA correspondent; responses to questions are unattributed; place and date not given: "From the Legal Point of View"]

[Text] [Question] What is the role and significance of the property of public organizations in the national economic system of our country?

[Answer] Let us begin with its significance. Pursuant to the USSR Constitution, Soviet citizens have the right to form parties and trade unions and set up athletic organizations on a voluntary basis. In our practice, organizations of veterans, children, women, and young people are frequently set up. The creative arts intelligentsia creates various unions (composers, artists, and so on). The humanization of our society has brought charity foundations to life. Material facilities are necessary for such activities. Buildings, structures, equipment, transportation, and other assets are needed; nor can they do without monetary funds. All of this amounts to property of public organizations, the defense and regulation of which is performed on the basis of the USSR Constitution and the recently adopted USSR Law "On Property in the USSR."

Several forms of property exist in our society. The property of public organizations is collective property. What does this mean? The collective as a whole is the bearer of the rights in this matter. As the lawyers put it, an association of persons is the subject of the rights in this case. The assets are considered to belong to the organization as a whole rather than to every member of the organization. This is why it cannot be divided up among members, unlike joint property in common. Even if the organization in question is discontinued, the assets are not distributed but are transferred to serve the goals envisaged by the organization's statute.

What is the place of such property? It is one of the types of collective property; however, unlike the property of leased enterprises, collective enterprises, cooperatives, and other types of collective property, it is used for nonproductive, noneconomic purposes. It is a means of ensuring the political involvement of citizens, cultural, educational, athletic, and health maintenance goals, and satisfying the scientific and other multifaceted interests of the citizens.

The assets of public organizations are not large compared to the productive assets of the country. For

example, the assets of the trade unions based on the revenue side of their annual budget amount to 4 billion rubles, and those of the CPSU to 2.5 billion rubles.

[Question] Could you discuss in somewhat more detail the assets and facilities belonging to public organizations by virtue of property rights and the sources from which such rights derive?

[Answer] The main objects of the property rights of public organizations are enumerated in Article 17 of the Law on Property in the USSR. These are buildings, structures, housing stock, equipment, inventory, assets with cultural, educational, and health maintenance functions, monetary funds, shares, other securities, and other effects necessary in order to support activities envisaged in the statutes of a public organization. They may also own enterprises created with the funds of public organizations. As a rule, the scope of the property objects of each organization is specified in the statutes (regulations) and other acts of public organizations taking into account the goals of operation of a given organization. Thus sanatoriums, recreation facilities, and tourist centers are prominent in the assets of the trade unions.

[Question] Where do the public organizations get their assets?

[Answer] First of all, by virtue of monetary dues paid by the members of an organization. Publishing and economic operations account for an important segment of revenues. The aid of the state and means donated by enterprises, associations, and organizations for facilitating the physical culture, work on inventions, and other work have accounted for a considerable pool of assets in the case of the trade unions.

For a majority of public organizations, initiation fees and membership dues constitute the foundation of their material and financial operations. Thus, in keeping with the annually adopted budgets, the trade unions of the USSR meet approximately 75 percent of their financial resource needs by membership dues, and the CPSU—60 percent. From the moment the dues are paid they become the property of a public organization. The aforementioned economic aid of the state, and of state and other organizations, plays a considerable role in forming and reinforcing the property of public organizations. For example, in 1960 a great number of sanatoriums and recreation facilities were transferred from state property to the property of the trade unions free of charge.

In general, the measures taken to aid the trade unions and the All-Union Society of Inventors and Efficiency Experts are a permanent source for replenishing their funds. For example, the law provides for the duty of economically accountable state organizations to transfer certain amounts to the All-Union Society of Inventors and Efficiency Experts and to finance the mass cultural and physical-cultural work of the trade unions. Proceeds from economic operations carried out by public organizations within the framework allowed by their statutes (publishing, holding concerts with paid admissions, lectures, athletic events, exhibitions, manufacturing and economic operations, and others), and appropriated by them, are insignificant in most organizations. However, such proceeds are the main item in some organizations, for example, the USSR Union of Artists and the USSR Union of Cinematographers. Transactions under the civil law constitute major legal grounds for the derivation of property of the public organization. As a result of sale and purchase contracts, delivery contracts, capital construction contracts, and certain other contracts, assets become the property of a public organization if it is a party to such obligations as a creditor. Donations and wills referred to in some statutes of public organizations (for example, the statute of the Union of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR) play the same role.

[Question] How is the right of property of public organizations defined in the legislation in effect? What are their opportunities in their capacity as owners?

[Answer] Under Article 19 of the Foundations of Civil Legislation, a public organization, like any other proprietor, has legal powers to possess, use, and manage the assets within the bounds set forth in the law. In civil law science, commentaries on this article unanimously stress the breadth of opportunities of an owner and his independence in managing his assets. For example, Academician A.V. Venediktov maintains that an owner exercises his legal powers "on his own authority and in his interest." The framework determining the limits to eventual actions of the owner may only be set by law. By now, these provisions have been directly codified in the Law on Property in the USSR. Article 1 specifies that an owner (including a public organization) "possesses, uses, and manages the assets it owns at his pleasure." He is entitled to commit any actions that do not contravene the law with regard to his assets, and to use the assets to carry out any economic or other activities that are not forbidden by law.

As we can see, the opportunities indicated are general and apply to all forms and types of property in the USSR. However, there are also special norms for public organizations as a particular variety of collective property. In particular, they are found in the civil codes of Union republics. Thus, under Article 102 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Civil Code, public organizations possess, use, and manage assets "in keeping with statutes (regulations)." It is stressed at the same time that "management devolves exclusively on the owners themselves." Hence the normative nature of provisions in the statutes of public organizations which involve the regulation of owning, using, and managing assets. For example, the norms of the Statute of USSR Trade Unions on rules for redistributing assets within the trade union system, procedures for the distribution of monetary funds received in the form of membership dues among trade union organizations, and so on are mandatory for all subjects, as well as for the courts and arbitration bodies.

[Question] We have been talking for a long time now about the property rights of public organizations, the ways such property develops, and so on. Still, the question is: Who specifically has this right, who is its subject-bearer?

[Answer] Responding to this question, we should first of all note that, according to our law, three categories of persons are recognized to be the subjects of property rights: citizens, organizations which have the status of corporate persons, and the state. The law (Article 24 of the Foundations of Civil Law, Article 17 of the Law on Property in the USSR, Article 102 of the RSFSR Civil Code, and others) refers to the property of public organizations; consequently, it exactly recognizes public organizations to be the bearers and subjects of such rights. Everything is very simple if a public organization which is a corporate person does not have within its structure elements and structural units endowed with the status of corporate persons. In this case, the entire public organization as such is the subject of property rights to its assets, including those in its structural subdivisions. This applies to all single-unit public organizations such as, for example, the Moscow Society of the Students of Nature.

It is more complex in the case of multiunit public organizations, which is what organizations uniting members throughout the Union or a Union republic are, as a general rule. Such organizations have within their composition large numbers or organizations which are independent corporate persons (for example, the number of corporate persons in the USSR trade union system is measured in hundreds of thousands). Who is to be considered the subject of property rights to the assets of public organizations in these cases? Civil law science is unanimous in answering this question. It is recognized that a public organization as a single entity (for example, the USSR trade union system, the CPSU as a single organization, the All-Union Society of Inventors and Efficiency Experts) is the subject of property rights to the assets of its organizations rather than individual elements of it (primary, oblast, and so on). It is also recognized that the latter, despite having distinct assets, and possessing, using, and managing the assets within the bounds set forth in the statute or regulations of the public organizations, are not the owners of these assets but have a different right to these assets—the right of operational management.

The legal nature of rights to the assets of economically accountable enterprises set up by public organizations is different. In keeping with Article 10 of the Law "On Enterprises in the USSR," such an economically accountable enterprise should be recognized to hold the right of full economic jurisdiction with regard to the assets allocated to it by a public organization, as well as those received as a result of production and economic operations. The public organization which set up the enterprise remains the owner of all its assets.

[Question] In March 1990, the USSR Law "On Property in the USSR" was adopted. How would you comment on it from the point of view of regulating the property of public organizations?

[Answer] An important step has been taken with a view to developing legal facilities for the operation of public organizations. More than just the indication that public organizations may own assets necessary to accomplish their statutory tasks has appeared in the law (as, for example, was written previously in civil legislation); it is said explicitly that these assets may include, for example, shares of an enterprise (this reference makes it possible for public organizations to invest their funds with a view to generating profits). The issue of enterprises as special objects of law is quite significant. Public organizations have been given an opportunity to accomplish their tasks through production activities as well. They may acquire and start not only, say, publishing houses and printing plants with a view to performing their cultural-educational functions, but they can also create enterprises producing athletic equipment, symbolic items, tourist equipment, and everything that is not only capable of facilitating their functions but also enriching them.

It is significant that the law has given up preferences for the protection of state property. From now on, the state ensures equal conditions for the protection of property rights of all owners. For example, previously the requests of state organizations to return state assets illegally owned by collective farms, cooperatives, and public organizations were not covered by the statute of limitations, whereas at present the protection of state property in the course of violations is restricted: The demand should be made within one year, as in the case of, for example, a trade union organ or any other public organization. There are no privileges. Likewise, the rule on the so-called unrestricted recovery of state property with regard to the opportunity to reclaim the assets regardless of the good faith of the buyer does not apply anymore. All owners "have equal protection from now on." The bona fide acquisition of assets in cases when the buyer did not know and could not have known that he is purchasing assets from a person who had no right to appropriate them will also be taken into account in the course of any reclaiming of assets (including by the state).

[Question] The readers are interested in constitutional guarantees of the property of public organizations.

[Answer] The USSR Constitution acknowledged and codified the assets of trade unions and other public organizations to be socialist property. To be sure, the Law "On Property in the USSR" no longer refers to the socialist character of this property form. However, having classified it as a collective form, the law did not reduce constitutional guarantees for this form of property but rather, as has already been said, enhanced them. As has been mentioned, the USSR Constitution affirms the right of citizens to unite in public organizations

which facilitate the development of political activity and independent endeavors and satisfy their varied interests. Understandably, the presence of asset facilities and property is such a condition.

[Question] Does the well-known amendment to Article 6 of the USSR Constitution on the preordained role of the CPSU in society mean any reduction in the guarantees of the asset rights of the CPSU?

[Answer] It does not. Equating the status of the party with that of any public organization means only that its legal protection, including that of its assets, will be so structured that it will not be either "higher" or "lower" than for other public organizations. Everything will be the same for all. This includes rights—not more, but not fewer either.

We know that at present the concepts of the redistribution of assets, including at the expense of CPSU property, develop in the course of perestroyka. In some places we have encountered attempts "to revise" the rights of trade union organizations. All of these issues may only be resolved on the basis of legality. The owner enjoys the right to exercise property rights, and use and exercise his powers in his own interest. The organs of the proprietor—congresses, central committees, soviets, and other organs empowered by the owner to exercise given legal rights—implement this will. In the absence of their will, no claims, demands, or decisions have a legal foundation.

[Question] What legislative documents confirm the property rights of public organizations to their assets?

[Answer] A contract to purchase assets or a contract by virtue of which a particular facility is erected by means of construction may be such documents. Most frequently, evidence is provided by the balance sheet of a public organization on which pertinent assets appear. There may be other evidence as well. It is necessary to take into account that the usual presumption is that of the legality and integrity of ownership. If doubts and claims arise, the side interested in the different ownership of assets should provide evidence that the assets belong to a different proprietor. All such disputes and claims may only be settled in the manner specified by law.

[Question] Do the local soviets of people's deputies have a right to cancel or establish property rights of public organizations by their decisions?

[Answer] No. Local organs of power have no jurisdiction over such issues, nor can they have it. Only the organs resolving disputes over assets may make decisions on establishing the illegality of acquisition, illegality of ownership, and so on provided there is a legal basis for this. As is known, the courts and arbitration services are such organs. Disputes between state organs, cooperative, and public organizations are subject to arbitration.

In practice, questions sometimes arise on the lack of a clear legal basis for acquiring buildings and structures many years ago. In particular, questions come up regarding the legitimacy of the acquisition of buildings in the initial years of Soviet power. Sometimes, doubts arise as to the legitimacy of the transfer of some assets to the trade unions by the state some time ago. This cannot be "re-resolved" by means of the organs of power making new decisions. These are disputes involving the law, and such disputes are subject to consideration by the arbitration service. If such disputes arise, they are considered with the participation of the parties and the study of documents. As has already been said, ownership by public organizations, including on the basis of property, is assumed to be in good faith, and the opposite must be proven by the party raising the issue of the illegitimacy of ownership. Therefore, state, including local, organs of power have a right to transfer assets to the ownership of public organizations within the confines of their jurisdiction. We have already discussed this. However, assets cannot be returned in this case without the consent of the owner. They can be given but not taken away. Naturally, this does not rule out voluntary transfers of assets by agreement of the parties when an organ so empowered, which expresses the will of the owner, agrees to the appropriation of its property.

In general, the discontinuation of property rights is only allowed by means of legislative acts and is definitely accompanied by the indemnification of the owner for damages caused by such an act (Article 31 of the Law on Property in the USSR). Therefore, any confiscation or other type of appropriation is out of the question.

[Question] In a number of cases, public organizations lease buildings and structures from, among others, the organizations of local soviets. What do they have a right to count on? Could demands be made that contracts with them be canceled or modified, or could their rents be increased?

[Answer] The principle of due compliance with obligations exists in civil law. In keeping with this principle, a unilateral refusal to comply with obligations and unilateral modifications of the terms of contracts are impermissible, except in cases envisaged by law. Due to this a public organization cannot be suddenly evicted from the premises it rents "just like that." The rent rates cannot be changed either before the expiration of the contract. When a contract is extended, its terms may be changed by agreement of the parties. The renter has the right to renew the contract (Article 13 of the Foundations of USSR and Union Republic Legislation on Leasing). Therefore, in this matter as well one's will cannot be imposed in an imperious manner on the other party. A renter is guaranteed protection of his rights to assets obtained by his rental agreement on a par with protection provided for his property rights.

[Question] In practice, office buildings were frequently built jointly by party and soviet organs; trade union organizations and the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist

Communist Youth League] became involved in such construction projects. Soviet organs are now raising the issue of the redistribution of space in such buildings referring to the need for material support of the operation of the soviet organs, self-government organs, committees, and commissions. What is the legal perspective on such disputes and conflicts?

[Answer] As we see it, it is better not to take such disputes to the point of legal disputes considered by arbitration bodies. The ultimate goals of party and soviet organs (and in pertinent cases also of the trade union and Komsomol organs) are the same. This means that mutually acceptable solutions should be sought. If a dispute grows into a legal conflict, there is nothing further to be done: Relations have to be built on the basis of law, and it will have to be determined what belongs to whom. In such situations this is determined by the essence of contracts on joint operations which applied to the joint construction of buildings. Assets acquired as a result of joint operations are the common property of parties to such a contract, and shares are determined in compliance with the contract. Usually the size of shares is proportionate to the investment of participants. The possession, use, and management of joint property in common are carried out by the agreement of all contributors to it. In the event of differences, the dispute is resolved in the arbitration organs by a lawsuit brought by any contributor.

[Question] How are disputes over property rights, leasing, and other disputes resolved? Can the assets of public organizations be subject to seizure? What is the statute of limitations on initiating such disputes?

[Answer] Disputes involving property rights (shares of common property) are resolved by the arbitration service by virtue of a lawsuit brought by an interested organization. Seizures in the course of the collection of the debts of public organizations cannot involve the buildings, structures, equipment, or other fixed assets owned by them. Cultural and educational funds cannot be seized either. Other assets, with exceptions specified in the law, can be seized.

As far as the statute of limitations is concerned, the general deadline of one year for defending the violated rights has been established. Therefore, as you would understand, disputes over rights to buildings which public organizations have owned for many years now do not make sense. The same is true for disputes over the size of shares in buildings and structures erected a long time ago and distributed among parties to contracts at the time.

Moscow Defense Plants Exhibit Civilian Products

LD2107123990 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] In Moscow, defense plants have held an exhibition of their civilian products to demonstrate their ability to manufacture consumer goods and articles for different industries.

Approximately 400 defense plants are already engaged in conversion, making equipment for the agro-industrial complex, consumer goods factories, and medical establishments. At present, one-half of their output are articles for civilian needs.

New Rubric in 'Political Dialogues' Cycle

LD2207192890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 22 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Tomorrow, 23 July at 1930 on Central Television's First Program there will be a direct broadcast of a new rubric in the "Political Dialogues" cycle—"Who's Who." In this program we will acquaint television viewers with new members of the Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretaries. On Monday, live on air, your conversation partners will be Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, member of the Politburo, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Galina Vladimirovna Semenova, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Valentin Aleksandrovich Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During the program you can ask questions of those taking part on telephones set up in the studio. Apart from this, questions can also be asked in advance tomorrow during the day from 0600 to 1600 on the telephone number 215-24-02. So, we shall expect you tomorrow at your television screens at 1930.

Publishers Combine To Pressure Paper Producers

PM2307141790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Yakovlev report: "Crisis Just Prior to Subscription Time: Why Publishers Are Creating Their Own Association"]

[Text] A meeting of leaders of a number of central, local, and cooperative publishing houses was held at the PRAVDA Publishing House 17 July 1990. The situation prevailing in the market in paper and communications and printing services was discussed. A decision was taken to create an association of newspaper and magazine publishers in the country. What dictated this?

In point of fact the sectors backing glasnost in the country are the first to enter the market economy. How this mechanism operates is not unimportant. And already there is a noticeable trend toward a sharp surge in prices for paper and all kinds of services. The government has to date declined to take on itself the allocation of funds for paper and proposes structuring relations among communications enterprises and publishers on a purely contractual basis.

And now, taking advantage of such license, paper and pulp combines are beginning to dictate conditions, tying the fulfillment of contract commitments to financial

injections from the publishing houses. While communications enterprises are citing the dire position of mailmen and the poor state of delivery facilities and are also threatening to increase their tariffs to 2.71 kopeks per newspaper copy and 50.6 kopeks per ruble on the sale of magazines. Printworkers, who lack sufficient resources to retool and modernize their deteriorating production facilities, are also making known their urgent needs.

To be frank, all those engaged in backing glasnost do indeed have considerable pressing problems. The whole question is what financial sources are to be used to tackle them. To date, however, everything comes down to the publishers or, more precisely, the subscribers, having to pay, since the price of paper has already increased from 270 rubles [R] to R400 per tonne now and will go up to R600 next year. And if we bear in mind that paper industry workers are seeking to further reduce the proportion of state orders, we can assume that prices could leap uncontrollably still higher. (Prices are already R3,000 and more per tonne in the market).

If the demands of all the subcontractors were accepted, virtually all publishing houses would be ruined and go under the hammer. Or have to drastically increase—by two to three times—the cost of newspapers and magazines, limit circulation, and sometimes simply close publishing houses which make little profit, including those for children and young people.

V. Leontyev, director of the PRAVDA Publishing House; D. Plesser, deputy director of the IZVESTIYA Publishing House; V. Yurkin, director of the MOLODAYA GVARDIYA Publishing House; V. Kostrov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Department of Administrative Affairs; and others who took part in discussion of the problems voiced a number of ideas on how to overcome the difficulties. The following were proposed, in particular: that tax concessions for publishing activity be sought; that the system of strict limits on allocating funds for paper be maintained, which will ensure regulation of the paper market; that the circulation of a number of publications be frozen—as ARGUMENTY I FAKTY had already done on its own initiative; that an alternative network of their own be set up to distribute, dispatch, and deliver periodicals; and that the placing of foreign consumers' orders be started in order to earn hard currency to buy paper abroad. Particularly as a number of publications are planning to use solely imported paper.

And most important of all publishing houses must overcome their disunity and learn to present a united front when faced with the diktat of departments which have paper and printing and distribution services in their hands. The first experience of a collectively elaborated stance in relations with the leading paper and pulp combines has already borne some fruit. The main objective of the association of newspaper and magazine publishers is to weaken the influence of negative factors on the market and reduce to a minimum additional expenditure borne by subscribers. The association will take on itself the resolution of questions concerning the cover price [nominal] for 1991 and prices for paper and communications and printing services.

Economic

Sitaryan Announces Currency Regulations

LD2407182790 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Georgiy Meizerov]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—The USSR Council of Ministers decided to improve retail trade and services for foreign currency on Soviet territory. The resolution on this score is to enter into effect on August 1 this year.

This was announced by Deputy Prime Minister Stepan Sitaryan, who heads the Soviet Government's Foreign Economic Commission, at a news conference here today.

In accordance with the resolution, a network of trade houses and firm-owned stores will be set up in the Soviet Union, where Soviet enterprises and organisations, as well as citizens owning currency, will be able to buy imported and high-quality domestic goods.

Speaking about reasons behind the decision, Sitaryan noted that Soviet enterprises have lately tended to accumulate foreign currency reserves to satisfy the requirements of their workers and employees. Individual Soviet citizens have nearly 200 million foreign currency roubles on their accounts, with which they can pay for a limited range of goods at Vneshposyltorg stores.

Some categories of the Soviet population have foreign cash at their disposal which they are not permitted to spend on Soviet territory under present Soviet laws.

When a currency retail trade and service network is organised, these three sources, as well as currency resources of foreign citizens in the Soviet Union, will give the state considerable income while curtailing foreign currency exports.

The obligatory declaration of the source of currency by Soviet citizens when opening currency accounts in the bank for foreign economic activities of the USSR will no longer be required. This will enable many Soviet citizens owning foreign currency to legalise it and use it on Soviet territory.

The deposits will provide a considerable sum in currency for the Soviet state which will be able to use it in its own interests. The interest policy will be reconsidered to provide additional incentive for depositors.

However, Sitaryan said, the Soviet Government is aware of the weak sides of introducing the retail trade for currency on Soviet territory. This can evoke protests and discontent on the part of some layers of the Soviet population.

"Still we found it necessary to take the step and enable state enterprises, cooperatives, collective farms and individuals owning currency to spend it in the Soviet Union," Sitaryan said.

Ryzhkov Answers Questions on Economy

904A0492A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN in Russian No. 29, Jul 90 p 3

[Responses to readers' questions by N.I. Ryzhkov: "Question and Answer"]

[Text] **N.I. Ryzhkov received 597 questions from 485 delegates concerning his report to the 28th CPSU Congress. The answers were given not only in his oral address, but also in printed material disseminated at the congress. The editorial staff selected from this material a portion of the answers to questions which are often encountered in letters from readers.**

[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN] Is leasing possible in the defense complex?

[Ryzhkov] Leasing in the defense complex is not prohibited. Today there are more than 400 enterprises in the complex that are not involved in the production of arms and military equipment and may be leased. In addition, individual structural subdivisions (and their property) of other enterprises may be leased if these subdivisions are not involved in the development and production of weapons and military equipment.

[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN] How do matters stand with writing off bank credit indebtedness from kolkhozes and sovkhozes?

[Ryzhkov] In order to create favorable economic conditions for the organization and operation of leasing collectives, peasant farms, and cooperatives formed on the basis of lands and property of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the USSR Law on the USSR State Budget for 1990 has established to write off the indebtedness of these farms for deferred long-term and short-term loans, putting these amounts down as an increase in state domestic debt. According to data of the USSR Agroindustrial Bank, about R27 billion in such debt of the total indebtedness of R68 billion have already been written off in the first six months of this year.

A decree has just been passed by the USSR Council of Ministers on writing off from kolkhozes, sovkhozes, other agricultural enterprises, and enterprises of the processing industry of the agroindustrial complex bank loan indebtedness deferred by decisions of the union government in the amount of R40.3 billion.

[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN] What has already been done to implement the highway construction program in the non-chernozem zone?

[Ryzhkov] During the period 1988-1989, 28,000 km of highways (108 percent of the target) were put into operation. Some 765 central farms of kolkhozes and sovkhozes have been linked to rayon centers by hard-top highways. This year it is planned to put 19,000 km of highways into operation in the non-chernozem zone.

[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN] Is it not time to suspend material and financial aid to foreign states, with the conditions of our country's difficult internal economic situation?

[Ryzhkov] Our country's economic situation and the worsening problem of foreign indebtedness in the world has forced us to decrease the amounts of state credits and gratuitous aid to foreign states. For example, whereas the 1989 budget called for granting R10 billion in such credits and 2.5 billion in gratuitous aid, the 1990 budget has reduced these amounts to R8.1 and R1.6 billion, respectively.

Indebtedness on previously granted credits was R88.2 billion as of the beginning of the year, about R5.4 billion of which are deferred. Repayment of credits in accordance with international agreements is distributed in the following manner: 1990—R7.5 billion; 1991-1995—R38.8 billion; 1995-2000—R28 billion; beyond the year 2000—R13.9 billion.

Granting credits in export deliveries, primarily of machinery and equipment, is a generally accepted world practice. It is practically impossible to sell machinery products, especially unitized equipment, without these credits.

[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN] Why is the consumer market so empty while monetary income is increasing?

[Ryzhkov] This year, according to data for five months, the population's monetary income exceeded expenditures for goods and services and payments to the financial and credit system by R2 billion compared to the corresponding period last year (in 1989 the excess was R23.1 billion; in 1990 it is R25.8 billion). The population's monetary income increased by 13.4 percent, and the volumes of produced industrial product and national income are below last year's level.

Wages in the National Economy (Rubles per Month)

	1985	1989
Total for national economy	190.1	240.4
Industrial personnel—total	210.6	263.7
Including:		
Blue-collar workers	208.5	255.4
White-collar workers	220.6	301.0
Kolkhoz farmers	153.4	196
Scientific research institutions	196.8	296.9
Design organizations	196.1	299.0
Planning and surveying organizations	185.4	389.0
Management staffs	168.8	222.0

Wages account for 50.5 percent of the increase in the population's monetary income, and the increase in wages in cooperatives accounted for 14 percent.

The wage fund in the national economy for 1989 increased by R47 billion, including by R14 billion for cooperatives.

Abalkin Supports Unemployment Relief Fund

LD2407151390 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—The initiative to create a public unemployment relief fund is a "serious change of public conscience in the right direction," Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Academician Leonid Abalkin said.

The initiative to create the fund was put forward by the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper.

"We have entered the stage when new structures should be formed," Abalkin said in an interview with the newspaper. "Their emergence is dictated by a future civil society, which envisages the creation of state, joint, public, cooperative and other organisations, whose functions have been performed by the state."

The academician believes the initiative to create such a fund attracts first and foremost by suggested active social protection measures, including the establishment of a jobs bank that could issue clear and accurate information on vacant jobs and requirements to candidates.

The newspaper quotes Soviet Scintific and Industrial Union President Arkadiy Volskiy as saying that "the union is ready to participate, including materially, in the fund's work." The Azerbaijani Communist Party Central Committee has also supported the idea.

Chamber of Commerce's Tasks, Problems Reviewed

90UF0352A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No. 29, 21-27 Jul 90 p 6

[Report on interview with V. Malkevich, chairman of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent D. Makarov; date and place not given: "The 'Trade Union' of Entrepreneurs"]

[Text] **Until quite recently the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry was better known abroad than in our country. Its functions amounted basically to organizing exhibitions, patenting inventions abroad, and resolving arbitration disputes.**

ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent D. MAKAROV discusses the new tasks of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the problems of foreign economic ties with V. MALKEVICH, chairman of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

[Malkevich] We see it as our main goal to introduce state enterprises and cooperatives that are members of the Chamber (and there are almost 7,000 of them) into the foreign market and to join foreign partners.

The enterprises are now gaining independence and sometimes they do not know what to do with their freedom; where to buy, and whom to sell to on the world market which is already saturated with goods. It is the duty of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry to help them with this.

[Makarov] Can we say that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry is a kind of trade union of entrepreneurs which is called upon to protect their interests?

[Malkevich] Exactly. We are moving up the date of the chamber's congress in order to establish the new goal: to protect entrepreneurs in the USSR. The trade unions are on the side of the workers; we are on the side of the entrepreneurs. For example, in Austria and Switzerland there are almost never any strikes because the chambers work in close contact with the trade unions there.

[Makarov] Are there many cooperators who are members of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry?

[Malkevich] Unfortunately, there are not. Up to this point we have been forced to select them carefully. We are trying above all to attract producers of high-quality products and only after we are convinced that they can compete do we put them on the foreign market, because our prestige depends on this—the country's and the chamber's. Therefore only 200 cooperators have become members of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. In the future we intend to adopt the practice of the Japanese. There the chamber does not permit nor does it prevent anyone from exporting their products; they simply issue a certificate saying that the products of this firm meet world standards.

[Makarov] Now the USSR trade representations abroad have stirred up a wave of our entrepreneurs eager to buy and sell, but frequently they do not know the elementary rules of trade.

[Malkevich] The trade representatives should provide them all kinds of assistance. This is their job. It is much worse when our new entrepreneurs do not go to the trade representatives or go there only after they are "in trouble" and have to be saved. And the Chamber of Commerce and Industry is needed so that such things will happen less frequently.

[Makarov] Perhaps it would still be worthwhile to place some restrictions on the activity of our new merchants abroad.

[Malkevich] I recently asked this question of the former U.S. secretary of the treasury, M. Blumenthal. His answer: By no means. The market itself will put everything in its place. It is necessary to go through this, like children have to go through the measles.

[Makarov] Since you are helping to create joint enterprises, explain why this work is going so slowly and why many of them exist only on paper.

[Malkevich] Alas, this is true. Although the number of registered joint enterprises is approaching 2,000, no more than 500 of them are actually in operation. The problem is not so much of our finding partners as of their finding us. Up to this point the government has no concept, no strategy for the development of business. We have not yet earmarked the branches to which we should attract foreign capital and technology first. We are being found by enthusiasts and persistent people who believe in our market, who patiently wade through our bureaucracy, like G. Cohon, president of the Canadian branch of McDonald's who spent 13 years on opening their first restaurant on Pushkin Square in Moscow.

The chamber has participated directly in the creation of approximately 500 joint enterprises. The overall sum of foreign investments in all joint enterprises is about $1.6 billion, although they have not enacted a law on mutual protection of investments either in the United States or in the USSR. This proves once again how important it is for us to develop relations especially with the United States, something many people do not understand. It is time to finally understand that we have nothing to dispute with the Americans and we must change over to cooperation.

And another thing: We must be able to understand the interests of our partners correctly. American businessmen are direct. As long as the USSR has no legislation that makes it possible to take the money earned in this country and convert it to dollars, we cannot expect a large influx of capital.

For many decades we have been experiencing some kind of inferiority complex, a fear that we will be deceived and robbed. In fact capital is always inclined toward reproduction: 70-80 percent of our profits must be invested in the modernization of production.

It is very difficult for us right now. The majority of our plants have technologies that are 10 years behind the times. Enlisting Western private investments will help to feed and clothe the country quickly and solve the problem of modernization of the economy.

[Makarov] Does this mean that, to use old terminology, we are destined to be "slaves of the foreign monopolies"?

[Malkevich] Not so long ago American capital dominated, say, in Japan and South Korea. But do you think that this caused Japan to become less Japanese or Korea to be less Korean? Now Japanese, West German, and other businessmen are actively buying up real estate in the United States and are controlling shares of American firms.

[Makarov] Can one say that the freedom of capital investments and their shifting over the earth are among the normal human rights, like the right to choose where to work and under what conditions?

[Malkevich] I think there is simply a biological freedom which must be present in all manifestations of human activity. The countries which have freedom of capital movement flourish. I have long been trying to convince our leadership of this but so far without success.

[Makarov] Vladislav Leonidovich, for five years you were the deputy minister of foreign trade. Tell us why in the reports of N.I. Ryzhkov devoted to economic reform, questions of foreign trade occupy only five lines?

[Malkevich] We prefer not to say a lot about unpleasant things. The problem is that, having granted enterprises the right to enter the foreign market, we naively thought that the producers of machine and technical products would immediately be able to change the structure of commodity turnover in foreign trade. This did not happen because our products are unable to compete. And they could not become competitive under the conditions of a general deficit. And, moreover, even if we were to produce competitive products, under conditions in which the world is divided up and economic ties have been developing over 100-150 years, it is naive to think that somebody will voluntarily give us their place in the sun which they have earned through generations. We can trade only in individual kinds of industrial products, and even this extremely modest success has been achieved at the cost of many years of hard work.

[Makarov] But, as before, voices are ringing out saying that with the deficit exports should be curtailed even more.

[Malkevich] These ideas lead us into an impasse. The entire world is working in the market and trying to win a place in it. Only the best is sold and this means that the market is the engine of progress.

The most surprising thing is that the suggestion to curtail exports was presented as the optimal variant of the solution to domestic problems at one of the last plenums of the CPSU Central Committee by the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukraine, V. Masol. Such is the level of competence of our leaders.

We cannot play with the world market; we must treat it like a thing of great value, especially since we have almost no presence there. To withdraw from the market now means to severely complicate the life of our future generations.

[Makarov] Well, what do you have to say about the creation of a market economy in our country?

[Malkevich] The entire process of changing over is taking much too long. The former chancellor of the FRG, H. Schmidt, told me once that "the market is like a parachute: It is only good when it is opened on time." We are still continuing our free-fall.

Directors Appeal to Government for Supplies

904A0503A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 18 Jul 90 p 1

[Article under the rubric "Sound the Alarm!": "Flat Refusal; Directors of the Country's Heavy Machinebuilding Factories Turn to the Government for Help"]

[Text] *The 1991 plans for the production of intricate mechanical engineering products manufactured by enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Heavy Machinebuilding, which are a vital necessity for the economy, are in real jeopardy. The reason is that there is as yet no decision on the procedure for providing the economy with material.*

The old system of limited supply is being dismantled, and the new one of market provision has not yet been elaborated.

Gossnab [USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] and its territorial authorities are offering enterprises their services in the sale of the industrial products without guaranteeing material support for its production.

Not only are the collectives of heavy industry enterprises threatened, and this involves millions of workers, but also the recipients of our products and the country's economy as a whole.

We directors of the commercial offices of all enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Heavy Machinebuilding, assembled in Moscow, have failed to receive an acceptable answer to any of our questions, and for this reason we request that the government issue a directive document prior to 1 August regulating the procedure of material support for the 1991 production plan based on the principle of a controlled market economy. In this it is essential that it provide for: preservation of the relations which have taken shape between suppliers and consumers, including pooled supplies on terms and in amounts not less than the 1989-1990 level; the obligation of the USSR Gossnab and its wholesale trade firms and territorial authorities to act, as required by the enterprises, as brokers upon the conclusion of contracts between suppliers and consumers with the functions of guarantor for providing the manufacturers of the mechanical engineering product with material resources, including imported supplies; the priority provision of material resources to the enterprises manufacturing new equipment and new consumer goods.

[Signed] *G. Sychevskiy, deputy director of the "Amurskiy Metallist" Plant; R. Epel, deputy general director of the Donetsk "Donetsgormash" Production Association; R. Skibich, deputy general director of the Lvov "Konveyer" Association—a total of 50 signatures.*

Comment of the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA New Management Methods Department

A group of the authors brought this letter to the editorial office. The editorial office is not the State Planning Committee or Gossnab and does not decide supply questions. However, the concern shared by the executives of the country's most important enterprises forces us to take a special look at the problem.

With an annual program of R70 million, for example, the "Donetskgormash" has not concluded a single contract for the supply of the material resources, articles, or intermediate products essential for the manufacture of its products. The association's reaction—it has not concluded a single contract for the supply of its products so much needed by the country's mining enterprises—is natural also. The picture is the same at "Amurskiy Metallist."

The wholesale trade firms and territorial supply authorities formed some time back merely took on the sale of the finished product. They are not bothered about how the components program is supported. This situation has led to the development of an exchange-in-kind market in the country. The boss here is whoever manufactures products in short supply. For example, on paper it is now possible to acquire everything from French cosmetics to automobiles and video equipment. But what about the enterprises which manufacture machine tools, diesel locomotives, and mining equipment? However paradoxical, it is the material-intensive industries of the sectors largely determining science and technical progress which have found themselves in a catastrophic situation.

In-kind commodity exchange was never an indicator of a civilized economy. What is the solution? The participants in the meeting offered the government their version of a solution to the problem.

This proposal may be viewed in various ways. Some people will see it as a return to the command-administrative system of management. But neither can we disregard the fact that no reform, especially a radical one, occurs overnight. The concern of the enterprise executives at the disarray in the relations of allied subcontractors is perfectly understandable.

What will the government's response be?

Ryazan Bids To Hike Consumer Goods Production

PM2407145590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Report by A. Naymushin and S. Nomerotskiy from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Shortages are a common problem for us all. Shortages of the most necessary products are felt both in the smallest villages and in the biggest cities. We need to find an urgent solution to the problem, of course. Let us see how this is being done in Ryazan.

[Reporter] [video shows various consumer goods on display] These are ordinary products—but you can spend all day looking for them in the stores and still not find them. The Ryazan Scientific and Technical Information Center organized this exhibition of consumer

goods which are brought into the oblast from outside but which could be manufactured by industry locally. It was of great interest to the city's inhabitants and to the leaders of factories and plants. This is one of the things encouraging enterprises to work vigorously for the consumer market. [video shows battery production shop] Each labor collective has outlined its own consumer goods production program. The capacitor plant, for instance, has set up a consumer goods shop and is manufacturing batteries for clocks, calculators, children's toys, and colored lights. Yes, heavy industry is capable of orienting itself in a proprietorial way toward people's needs. The reserves and the potential exists, so let us be enterprising. [video shows interior of textile plant, Italian machinery] But the pace in this important work is being set by light industry, which is starting to restructure itself—however hard it may be. In the space of a year the Ryazan Sewn Goods Factory has seen changes unprecedented in the 60 years of its history. They have carried out a modernization. The Italian firm "Necchi" has supplied modern equipment. The whole process is automated and computerized from the preparatory stage, through the material-cutting stage, to the sewing shop. Production is more efficient now, output has increased by 87 percent. Wages are higher and discipline better.

Problems of Defense Industry Conversion Viewed

PM2407145590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Report from the FED Association, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A five-year state conversion program was adopted recently and, as you will recall, met with enthusiasm. Further, transferring the mighty military-industrial complex to the needs of the people is indeed a noble task. But, as with every business, this program has its reverse side.

[Reporter] [video shows cameras being assembled in workshop] FED [expansion unknown] cameras are well-known. But I think that few people know that these and a few other consumer goods represent just the tip of the iceberg in this association's output. High-tech apparatus for aviation and the missile-space complex forms 80 percent of its production. FED has the monopoly on numerous articles. But conversion has erupted and, as was often the case in the past, administrative organs have zealously rushed to fulfill orders and immediately stop defense production and expand consumer goods production by the same amount.

[A.A. Zhdanov, general director of FED Association, facing camera] This stage takes time. Unfortunately, our country merely proclaimed the conversion. All enterprises found themselves in a very complex situation, without a law on conversion.

[Reporter] How, for instance, are we to hang on to qualified personnel and unique technology? How can we boost labor productivity with wage freezes? Particularly with the high wages paid by cooperatives? And, lastly, won't you face ruin if you do not have the opportunity either to independently fix the price of output or to dispose of it on the market? Even when selling aviation assemblies abroad, the enterprise gets just 18 percent of the hard currency obtained. "Aviaeksport" gets 75 percent for mediation services. But FED's managers must be given their due. They have succeeded in holding onto their cadres and in expanding production. While backing the transition to the market, people here are also thinking about how to render the enterprise profitable within our by no means market-based relations.

[A.A. Zhdanov] Our council—the technical council, the economic council—decided that our ultimate aim is to set up a joint-stock company. Obviously the market will result in unemployment during the transitional period. We must therefore be ready for that.

[Reporter] However, according to estimates, FED has survived the ordeal. It is developing tremendous social protection for workers, retraining them, providing them with housing, and giving autonomy within the association to both plants and workshops. After some increases in their prices, consumer goods are now being sold at a lower price and production is set to expand. New workers will be needed for this. Direct contacts have been outlined with Western aerospace complexes that are extremely interested in procuring various components, so FED will be forced to compete with similar enterprises. So long, monopoly!

[Announcer] I would like to add that this will only happen if an antimonopoly law is adopted. Everything indicates that the Defense Ministry has no intention of keeping its advantages or, obviously, holding back enterprising people. But only 23 of the 585 types of new equipment entrusted to defense sectors over the last nine months of last year have been assimilated. You will agree that that is not a great deal. That is why there are still quite a large number of goods in short supply in our country.

Implications of Economic 'Pluralism' Viewed

PM2007134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by A. Ulyukayev under the "Polemical Notes" rubric: "That Is Why the Mast Is There"]

[Text] So far publicists have debated whether there should be a market or not. Now that the government concept of the transition to the regulated market economy has appeared, legislators and to a certain extent the entire country have actively joined in the debate. But as soon as market relations become reality, the polemic will move to a qualitatively new level and the main partners will become involved: the government, goods producers, and trade unions.

Indeed, the preliminary skirmishes have already begun. There are skirmishes over the taxation of the wages fund, freight shipment tariffs, and prices for diesel fuel and confrontation between the Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] on commercial and auction trade. You do not need the wisdom of Solomon to foresee the aggravation of the conflicts in conditions of freer price formation and rigid measures to reduce the money supply.

How should one regard all this? Calmly, in any event. This is the normal pluralism of interests which must replace the philosophical, historical, and socioeconomic monism established in our country. One ideology, one people, one party, one power. All working people think and act in the same way.

There are many people now denouncing group egoism, as it is known. This term is taken to mean now the gradual disappearance of cheap goods, now the cooperative tendency toward profit, but not toward philanthropy. But was the old egoism of the monolithic structure, representing the single official will and official morality, really preferable?

Each citizen in a normally organized society, just like each collective and community, has objectively different positions in the national economic and social structure, and thus objectively different interests, assessments, criteria, and view of the future.... An enterprise administration, for example, sees and evaluates a situation completely differently from the workers, just as the trade unions' assessments differ from the government's and the consumers' from the producers'.

This is the guarantee and evidence of the viability of a social organism. That is why the calls for cooperative members to put themselves in the consumers' place and see the world through their eyes are pointless and illusory. Indeed, it isn't even necessary. Right is established in the real process of life. Furthermore, the multitude of viewpoints and pluralism of opinions are the only guarantee that there will be a multidimensional area of economic relations here instead of the one-dimensional line of the "only correct course."

Historically in our country the enterprise became the center for the concentration of almost all types and forms of daily activity. Soviet man doesn't just work and earn his living in his workplace but also receives coupons for goods there, converts his pay into goods from the mobile store, and satisfies his needs for housing, leisure, medical treatment, and the preschool education of his children, sometimes even their schooling itself. He climbs various rungs of the sociopolitical ladder there and carries out his political activity.

A man is enclosed in the labor collective, generally speaking that extremely narrow nucleus which has developed from a production entity into an all-purpose socio-economico-politico-cultural-consumer one.

Worse than that, the combination of so many functions is also an obstacle to the division of labor and the division of powers, especially at the micro level. As a result, all these functions are fulfilled badly because they become intermingled. In contrast, too much power over people is concentrated in some hands—whatever their name, the administration or the labor collective.

The division of powers, in my view, may be regarded not only as a principle for building civil society but also as the basis of an efficient economy. The division of the functions of daily activity in society is the foundation of the free development of the individual and the safeguard of an acceptable level of his well-being and social protection.

Prices, profits, wages, and norms of accumulation and consumption—all these are social relationships. That is, relationships among real social groups: where they intersect and diverge, merge and repel, confront one another or reach compromise.

Wages rates in a democratic society are determined not on the basis of someone's ideas about how they will encourage labor productivity or the extent to which they help to achieve the planned level of prosperity. They are the essence of the form of the correlation of the forces of independent trade unions working to achieve a sensible wage raise; and of independent entrepreneurs working to reduce production costs and thus to lower or freeze wages; and finally a strong authority striving for stable labor relations, economic efficiency, and social peace and therefore maneuvering with varying degrees of success between the opposing sides of the conflict.

Similarly, retail prices are determined not on the basis of any—even the most scientific—ideas of social justice or the optimum structure of consumption but on a comparison and correlation of the strengths of consumers, producers, and middlemen and the political structures that reflect their interests.

It is understandable that such a comparison of interests is possible only in conditions of a civil society with its many structures. One is to be formed in our country by the economic and political reforms. The early stage of the development of a civil society, which we called a "rally-based democracy," produces as a rule conflictual forms of comparison including strikes, lockouts, and boycotts. Then a culture of reciprocal concessions and compromise is elaborated step by step. The ideology based on the principles "death before surrender" and "there are things more important than social peace" gives way to the ideology of peaceful coexistence and honest competition between social forces in which each one does not lose its originality or adopt the other's position. In other words, what you have is a mutual enrichment of social forces.

But the attempts to form at micro level some kind of unity of ownership, labor, and management—and that is how an enterprise collective is viewed at the moment—whether in the garb of the socialist self-management of

the workers, as was fashionable a few years ago, or in the attire of collective (people's) ownership, which became acceptable recently, will not produce any universally significant results. This does not mean, of course, that it is necessary to end the experiments on this sphere. Not at all. This form, like any other, has every right to exist in a free society. But we should not pin all our hopes on it as a panacea.

Collective enterprises are, undoubtedly, a colossal step forward from the departmental-bureaucratic form of economic management. But we should think not only about steps "away from" but also steps "toward."

The arguments for collective ownership and collective management link the worker-coowner with income but not with capital, with distribution but not with accumulation. The structure of collective enterprises is primarily aimed not at increasing efficiency but at maintaining stability. This structure shackles the labor and capital markets and effectively prevents their normal functioning. The efficient redistribution of labor and financial resources between sectors, regions, and spheres of management creates a barrier by binding the worker through a bundle of "labor shares" to "his" enterprise.

Can one talk about closing down old-fashioned production units? After all, they will be collectively owned. And their collectives will make every effort, even to the point of social blackmail and powerful pressure, to protect themselves from all structural transformations which threaten the stability of their existence. They will try with might and main to hang on to their existing production program and prevent it from being changed under pressure from market fluctuations.

For the collective coowner, the significance of remuneration for current labor is deliberately greater than future profit. And those for whom profit, as a factor of the future and a guideline of change, would be paramount do not exist in this system at all.

The preference for stability over change, which is characteristic of collective enterprises, leads to their technological conservatism and unpreparedness for fundamental scientific innovations. The mass nature of collective enterprises is the real obstacle to a fully fledged market, scientific and technical progress, and effective economic management.

Of course, real economic pluralism and the existence of opposing forces create conflict situations which will have to be resolved whenever they occur. And the search for a solution will be difficult. But I think that we have already had enough of the conflict-free stagnation, the conflict-free morgue.

But supposing there is no solution at all? Do the recent labor-related economic and political conflicts not show that instead of the promised dynamism matters could end in the complete paralysis of the national economy? I think not. The crisis character of our situation, in my view, has been defined as the displacement and confusion of the subjective roles in the conflict. These, after all, were clashes not between working people and employers, not between labor and business but between the state and its errant sons. In other words, not a phenomenon of civil society but a family squabble. Instead of being an authoritative and disinterested arbiter, the state is forced to defend itself, to attack, in short to do battle. And the forces opposing it of course are immediately seen as the enemy. After all, they are fighting the state.

Doubtless many people are familiar with radio masts. They are held up by cables, each going in its "own" direction. That is what keeps the mast up. The principle of counterweights, well known since ancient times, is also used in the latest technologies. For example, the Japanese used it in creating earthquake-resistant houses. It is also applicable in the mechanics of social mutual relations.

What will be the result in our country of the meeting of different interests clashing in different ways? It will hardly be an effective market or responsible democracy. However, the gradual structuring of society and the economy is a necessary condition to attain those heights. True, there is little definite that can be said right now about the timetable and outcome of this transitional period. On the other hand, it may be stated with full responsibility that given the weakness of the political and economic structures, the growth of both political and economic freedoms is the sure path to social confrontation and chaos. And vice versa. There are two alternative means of preventing chaos. One, tried and tested over decades, is the denial of freedom, a clampdown, and state tyranny. The other is the consistent combination of the cultivation of freedom with the creation of a structured framework for it. Only this method can transfer the political struggle from the rally to parliament; labor conflicts from clashes through strikes to constructive talks; and market competition from attempts to destroy one's rival to the assertion of professional ethics.

Ministry Opposes Shipping Line's Switch to Lease

PM2407083590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Report by S. Dukhavin and A. Kulikov from the Vremya newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] In years to come historians studying our perestroyka battles in society and the economy will undoubtedly examine the conflict that has been disturbing the country's maritime fleet for several months now. It is a typical conflict these days and its results will probably be typical too—and that's why this whole episode is of particular importance both for us today and for the historians of the future. I'm referring to the Baltic Steamship Company's battle for economic autonomy—or rather, its battle to switch to the lease system. The

company is waging this battle with its boss—the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet. It's an acute conflict—the top echelons of the country's economic leadership have already been drawn into it. The public's attention has also been drawn to it, and articles about the clash have already appeared in LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and IZVESTIYA. "Vremya" will fill you in on the current state of this conflict.

[Reporter] This has already become the tradition, or rather—the normal working practice—for the Baltic Steamship Company. Each Wednesday morning the company's service chiefs meet in the captains' meeting hall and efficiently resolve all current issues—both social and production issues—without formalism. And only one issue remains unresolved—the lease system. That is, the river people came to a decision on this long ago. Back in February a labor collective conference adopted the decision to set up a leasehold enterprise. It sent the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet all the economic background, draft contracts, and statutes, but things didn't budge an inch. People at the top refuse to give the go-ahead. At the party congress—where the department leadership was present, incidentally—the idea of the need to untie collectives' hands was loudly voiced. The question arises: Perhaps the ministry is concerned about the country's welfare, and the lease system might not be advantageous for the fleet. Not at all. On the contrary, last year alone the contract method with elements of the lease system used on seven of the company's ships produced a profit of 5 million rubles over and above the plan. So why have things come to a halt?

[V.I. Kharchenko, chief of the steamship company] I am convinced that this trend is proceeding at this rate, and is spreading throughout the country—the number of leasehold enterprises has increased sevenfold during the year. This means the movement is growing. Initially I just called on our ministry to help us. But now I've realized that we have to pool our efforts in order to convince them that we should switch to the lease system. It will do nothing but good for our fleet and for the country as a whole.

[Announcer] Here in the studio we have Gennadiy Davydovich Gerasimchuk, USSR deputy minister of the maritime fleet. Gennadiy Davydovich, is your ministry's position changing, are its leaders' convictions changing?

[Gerasimchuk] Vladimir Fedorovich, you must realize that our positions cannot change. The point is that if a single steamship company left the ministry's control the integrated system for ensuring the national economy's requirements for shipments would break down. The country will lose more from this than the Baltic Steamship Company will gain. We would be forced to charter a large amount of foreign tonnage for the routes we need, and the Baltic Steamship Company's earnings would in no way cover the country's expenditure in freely convertible currency.

[Announcer] Why in this particular case does the lease system seem to be at odds with the country's interests?

[Gerasimchuk] The point is that a lease collective is entitled either to accept or to refuse a state order. It can carry it out or not. The country may need to ship grain, but the shipowners may find it profitable to earn freely convertible currency by shipping cargo on foreign charters.

[Announcer] Nonetheless, as I understand it, the Baltic Steamship Company has counterarguments—its own position. You are sticking to your own convictions, so to speak. But this conflict cannot go on forever. Just how is it going to be settled?

[Gerasimchuk] The Council of Ministers has adopted a decision to set up an independent commission to examine the calculations produced by the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet and the Baltic Steamship Company—although the latter has not supplied its figures yet, regrettably. The figures will be examined in August and we'll have the results in September.

[Announcer] Well then, in September we'll invite you back to the studio to conclude the discussion about this conflict.

[Gerasimchuk] Thank you.

Gossnab Official Discusses Gasoline Shortage

LD2407154790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 24 Jul 90

["Interview" with (Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Ruskovskiy), head of the Petroleum Products Department of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Ruskovskiy] I am (Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Ruskovskiy), head of the Petroleum Products Department of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gossnab]. All republics have enough diesel fuel to provide for the agro-industrial complex and the remaining links of national industry.

The situation with gasoline is worse. There is a number of reasons here: Supplies of oil by the Ministries of Oil and Petroleum Industries directly for oil refining. The supplies are falling behind the requirements of the state order by more than 20 million tonnes per year, and this showed that over the first six months of this year—compared to last year—we failed to refine more than 10 million tonnes of oil, and received about 1.7 (?million tonnes) of gasoline less than we were due. So this is the reason that currently makes this problem so acute, so to speak.

There is a number of complaints against oil refining plants. [plant name indistinct] produces a lot of fuel oils; it does not produce light fuels, particularly gasoline. Other plants are restricting the production of gasoline,

which is in great demand in the country, owing to the absence of the liquid body which they did not pay for in time. We do not look into the depth of the refining. One still can hear at present that furnace fuel oil is not being taken for refining, and the refining is restricted. For example, more than one million tonnes of fuel oil above plan were exported from Ukrainian plants only, which instead of producing light fuel, produced fuel oil. At present, there is extensive harvesting taking place there. [passage omitted]

I also would like to say that Russia has failed to satisfy the interrepublican demand for supplies of gasoline by about 300,000 tonnes over this period of time. [passage omitted]

New Car Undergoes Road Trials

LD2407142290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Report by correspondent T. Baulinaya from Sushenskoye, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Numerous curious people gathered in Ufa, Chelyabinsk, Omsk, and Novosibirsk—everywhere where the brightly colored convoy of new Kamaz vehicles stopped during their longest road trials ever. At Sushenskoye, the last point on the Siberian highway, crowds immediately formed near the latest model of huge trucks and the extremely tiny "Oka" cars.

Naturally, there is special interest in the "Oka." It is the only Soviet-made small car since the first "Zaporozhets." Our biggest automobile works, a joint operation with the "VAZ" plant, having overtaken the much-afflicted "Yelabuga" works, has issued the first 400 cars as consumer goods. And this batch is now undergoing tests.

This year, the Kamaz production line will turn out 3,000 "Oka" vehicles; exactly as many as the "VAZ" plant will make. In all, the projected production capacity stands at 50,000.

The "Oka" is said to be very popular, not only because of its reasonable price—3,500 rubles—but also because of its excellent technical specifications.

Having successfully passed its planned trials and having undergone five-day road trials in Ulyanovsk, the "Oka" has again proven its quality in a difficult and long drive in the conditions of the Urals and Siberia.

Trans-Siberian Railroad Electrification Planned

PM2007125190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 19 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The electrification of the final section of the Trans-Siberian Railroad has begun. The work is scheduled to be completed in 1998. At the turn of the century electric locomotives will be able to travel from the western border of the USSR to the Pacific.

Agricultural

Yegor Stroyev Views Agrarian Issues

LD2407142490 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Dzyublo]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Yegor Stroyev, a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Central Committee secretary, began his first working week in his new post by making a tour of farms in the Ryazan region, central Russia.

He knows agriculture inside and out, as he was born in a Russian village, tended the farm's cattle and later studied to become an agronomist. After becoming full-time party functionary, Stroyev also dealt with agricultural issues. At 36, he was secretary of the regional party committee in Oryol, the centre of Russia's traditional agrarian region. Last year he was elected secretary of the Party Central Committee and recently became a member of the Politburo.

Asked about the situaion in the village, Stroyev replied that people "should not reconcile themselves to agriculture's position as an investment donor for the development of other industries. The village has been plundered. The poverty, especially in middle Russia, is beyond tolerance," Stroyev said.

He claims that "the policy of protectionism as regards the agrarian complex should penetrate all spheres of state activity, as is done in most developed countries. This is especially important during the transition to a regulated market economy."

According to Stroyev, the transition to the market should start with the agrarian complex, which accounts for 90 per cent of foodstuffs and 70 per cent of the country's retail trade turnover. Some people blame the communist party for the peasant's woes, he says.

"I agree that a lot of mistakes have been made in agriculture. But the peasant should address the main bill to the command-and-bureaucratic system. Today this system tries to pass this bill onto the party, to blame it for everything," he notes.

Stroyev believes that "it is wrong to claim that agriculture has been a series of mistakes." He makes a comparison: "Before the revolution the yield of grain in central Russia was around 11 centners per hectare in the best years, while now the hectare yields 40, 50 and even 70 centners in the same areas."

The authority of the Communist Party can be preserved and strengthened among village dwellers, Stroyev continues, "if the party gets down to the long overdue problems of the agrarian complex." It is important nowadays to link the idea with pragmatism and, importantly, to place perestroyka advocates in key posts.

Stroyev is satisfied with the work of the 28th party congress. "If the first days of the congress were unequivocal, later, when it focused on problems of perestroyka and the advance of society, it made good decisions, both bold and unconventional."

Asked whether the Central Committee apparatus dealing with agrarian issues will remain in place, he replied: "Such a generating body is indispensable, although the structure and size of the apparatus will change. The main body of work will be done in localities, at grassroots level," Stroyev says.

Harvesting Campaign Hampered by Shortages

PM2507091190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 p 1

[Ye. Arakelyan feature: "Will We Get By?"]

[Text] The reports are pleasing: There is an unprecedented grain crop harvest in many parts of the country. Will we have bread?

Our correspondent put this question to A.Ye. Yukish, deputy chief of the Main Food Resources Administration under the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases.

[Yukish] Actually, in many regions the harvest is expected to be greater than last year's. But so far the rate of sale of grain to the state is lower. As at 16 July, it had purchased 5 million tonnes less than last year.

[Arakelyan] But after all, it is known that purchase prices have been raised...

[Yukish] Nevertheless, people in rayons, oblasts, and republics are trying to hold onto a bit more grain for feed.

[Arakelyan] How can they be motivated not to hold back grain for themselves?

[Yukish] That is a complex question. In my view, the importance of the quickest possible sale of grain to the state must be explained. The state orders—which are completely realistic for the current year at 85.3 million tonnes—must be fulfilled without fail.

From the Editorial Office

We have, of course, always had problems with harvesting. In bad years we have suffered with the weather, in good ones with the harvest. Here is this year's familiar picture: There is a shortage of people, trucks, fuel, reapers, tires—in general, as always, of everything. And, as usual, combine harvesters in some regions are standing idle owing to a lack of gasoline, while others, for some reason or other, have bought so much of it in one go that it cannot be unloaded. And a good part of the railroad car rolling stock—300-350 cars every 24 hours—is involved in the shipment of corn from across the ocean from Novorossiysk.

Traditional difficulties have been complicated by new ones. City enterprises have now begun to refuse to send people and machines for harvesting—because of economic accountability.

Until quite recently, problems like these would have been resolved in a couple of seconds: There would have been a phone call from the proper place and some pressure and intimidation. And recalcitrant leaders would have raced each other to ship the grain. The command system is gradually collapsing. And thank God. But the economic incentives proposed by the government are not yet operating. Leaders in the provinces prefer to have a bird in the hand rather than two in the bush. And it is better to have even a little feed left over rather than money with which there is simply nothing to buy.

Incidentally

According to FAO (UN Food and Agriculture Organization) forecasts, this year the USSR has a chance of gathering around 210 million tonnes of grain, which would be 8 million tonnes more than last year. But, according to this organization's estimates, the USSR will remain, as before, one of the major grain importers.

Favorable Grain Harvest Prospects Noted

LD2407140190 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] According to the prognostications of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, this year the Soviet Union will have the opportunity to harvest some 210 million tonnes of grain—more than it did last year. According to reports, grain crops in many areas of Russia, the Ukraine, and Moldavia are very rich. The leaders of the State Commission on food believe that the targets for state grain purchases are likely to be reached.

On the threshold of harvesting, the purchasing prices were considerably heightened, which gave more incentive to farmers. However, difficulties in transporting the harvested grain and in insuring fuel supplies have given rise to concern.

Kuban, Don, Stavropol Harvest Progress Reported

PM2007135990

[Editorial Report] Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian on 20 July 1990 carries on page 1 a roundup of correspondent reports on harvest progress around the country under the "Harvest Day by Day" rubric.

In a 19 July report from Krasnodar headlined "Kuban Millions" Yu. Semenenko reports that "more than 2 million tonnes of grain have already reached the kray's storage elevators." With winter wheat sales already in excess of 1.9 million metric tons and contractual volumes of durum and valuable wheat sales "fulfilled twice over," Semenko reports, "dozens" of farms with cereal yields of 60-70 quintals per hectare have fulfilled their

state orders and are continuing to sell grain. "Daily grain sales to the state in the kray are currently averaging 220,000 tonnes," Semenko concludes.

In a 19 July Rostov-na-Donu report headlined "Don Grainfield Harvest" Yu. Maksimenko said that this is "the first time in the entire history of Don farming that grain farmers have obtained a harvest like this year's.

"An average of 36 quintals of grain, six quintals per hectare more than last year, has been gathered from the more than 1.2 million hectares already threshed."

"Collective and state farms," Maksimenko reports, "have already sold over 1 million tonnes of grain to the state." Daily deliveries to storage elevators total 200,000 tonnes, with two-thirds of the grain being classified as hard and valuable grain.

An undated report from Stavropol Kray by S. Timofeyev headlined "Beating the Weather" reports: "In Stavropol more than 80 percent of the grain area has been threshed. The average yield is 34.9 quintals per hectare; over 5 million tonnes of grain have already been threshed; and over 1.2 million tonnes, mainly durum and valuable wheat, have been sold to the state."

Weather, Crop Conditions Reported in Mid-July

904B0260A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 19 Jul 90 p 2

[Article by N. Ignatova, agricultural meteorologist: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] It grew colder over a large part of the USSR's European territory at the beginning of the second ten-day period.

Maturation of grain crops is continuing. Among the winter crops, the grain achieved complete ripeness in the southern half of the Ukraine and in Moldavia, the Northern Caucasus, and the Lower Volga region, and the spring barley fully ripened south of the Kirovograd-Dnepropetrovsk-Donetsk-Lugansk-Volgograd line. Conditions for grain harvest were good. The weight of harvested grain is close to the annual average. To the north of the Brest-Belgorod-Saratov-Kuybyshev-Orenburg line, the winter wheat and rye were observed to have achieved milky ripeness. Over a large part of the USSR's European territory, the early spring grain crops were forming ears, blooming, and forming grain. Conditions for the development and formation of grain were good for the most part and satisfactory in a number of regions.

Conditions improved for the growth and development of corn which, over a large part of the grain-cultivation zone, continues to add vegetable bulk and has formed 11-17 leaves. In a number of the southern regions of the Ukraine and in Krasnodar Kray, emergence of ears was noted in the corn that was planted early. Moisture supply for crops in the majority of the regions was good. The moisture supply in Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays and in Rostov Oblast worsened due to hot and dry weather.

Over most of the territory of the beet-producing zone, the supply of warmth and moisture was sufficient for growth of the root crop of sugar beets. The greatest increase (60-80 grams over the ten-day period) was in the Northern Caucasus, Moldavia, the Baltic Region, Belorussia, and in the central oblasts of the Ukraine.

Over a large part of Belorussia, the Central-Chernozem and Volga regions, the western Northwest region, the Baltic region, and the southern Central and Volga-Vyatka regions, potatoes flowered to a haulm height of 30-40 cm, which is several centimeters lower than last year. Formation and growth of tubers continued under conditions of elevated soil temperature and good moisture supply. The spread of Colorado potato beetles was noted in many regions, and favorable conditions were created for the development of late blight.

In the southern regions of the USSR's European portion, gathering of the harvest of early varieties of cabbage and cucumbers was underway. In places in Moldavia and the Lower Volga region tomatoes reached flesh-colored ripeness.

In the agricultural regions of Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan, the early spring grain crops were forming ears and blooming.

In the republics of Central Asia and in southern Kazakhstan, the air temperature fell a little and was close to the annual average. The harvest of winter grain crops began in southern Kazakhstan, and in the other republics it has already been completed. Gathering of tomatoes, cucumbers, and cabbage continues. Mass blooming of cotton was noted over a large part of the cotton-growing regions.

New Small Combine Harvester Begins Testing

PM2407101990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Report by N. Chebotarev and V. Yablokov from "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A new combine harvester is available for rural leaseholders. Series production will begin in the next few years.

[Reporter] KZS-3—that is the name of the Taganrog Combine Plant's new product. The first two machines have been sent for testing. [Video shows combine in action, driver's cab] The combine, as you can see, has a comfortable air-conditioned cab with good visibility and an electronic performance monitoring system. The series-production engine has 80-100 horsepower. The size of the engine can be ordered by the customer.

[General designer N. Chebotarev] The small size makes it possible to work at high speed on small plots of land, making use of its maneuverability. The combine can

handle crops from three to five meters [width of cut]. Machine operators or leaseholders can order the combine that matches their yield. The combine comes with attachments which will be specially designed for harvesting pulse crops, grass seeds, corn, and sunflowers.

[Reporter] Aleksandr Ilich, the obvious question: When will it be available?

[A.I. Gerasimenko, general director of the plant] In 1993.

[Reporter] The question everyone will be interested in: How much will it cost?

[Gerasimenko] It won't be that much—between R500 and R1,500.

[Reporter] Let us hope that mass production of the combines will begin in 1993 and no later. The plant has changed from the classic method of preparing new products—they have not waited for the completion of the tests but have immediately embarked on developing the technology.

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts To Make Space Walk 26 Jul

LD2507083690 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] The two Soviet spacemen manning the orbiting complex Mir are basically prepared for another walk into raw space. A Radio Moscow reporter was told at mission control that at about 1600 Moscow time on Thursday Aleksandr Balandin and Anatoliy Solovyev are to open the air hatch and leave the craft to inspect the scientific instrumentation mounted on the main station and research module and repair the hatch.

Cosmonauts' Research Program Summarized

PM2307125190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "News From Orbit"]

[Text] Flight Control Center, 20 Jul—Anatoliy Sovolyev's and Aleksandr Balandin's work program for the week included astrophysical research and industrial and biological experiments.

The crew prepared the new "Zona-03" industrial installation for operation. Its purpose is to obtain highly pure semiconductor materials in weightlessness and space vacuum conditions. The first smelting was carried out on the installation on 18 July.

Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin will rest on Saturday and Sunday.

New Instrument Helps Locate Water Main Leaks

PM2407142190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Report by L. Kushnarenko and A. Arbuzov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Some things in Moscow's economy, as you know, have been neglected—and this applies to the water supply in particular. Now innovators from Novokuznetsk have come to the capital's rescue.

[Reporter] [Video shows "Teakkorr" equipment, workers using it] Muscovites did not obtain this instrument, which promises its owners untold riches, for their underground services just because they are residents of the capital. Specialists from "Mosvodoprovod" themselves helped the Novokuznetsk innovators develop a system that would cost as much as R35,000 abroad—a tidy sum. Each year Moscow loses R10 million in drinking water because of damaged mains. It is lost because the damage is hard to locate, and on each occasion workers have to dig three or four holes before finding the leak. But the system from the Novokuznetsk "Elektronika" Enterprise can locate the source of a leak instantly. Just one instrument can save its owners up to R500,000 a year. One hundred instruments have already been manufactured. And the people who have pooled their efforts under the "Elektronika" trademark are already prepared to share their equipment with other cities. But water saving is by no means the only function of this system, which is known as "Teakkorr."

[A.P. Zrazhevskiy, chief of the "Mosvodoprovod" Repair Service] ...fuel lines, it has all kinds of uses for pumping acids, and pumping most varied acid products. [Sentence as heard] Moreover, using special instruments, the equipment can be used to locate leaks in gas pipelines. It can be used in oil pipelines, and it would be very useful at nuclear power stations.

Military

Moiseyev Attends General Staff Party Meeting

PM2407110190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Jul 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Colonel O. Nikonov: "Along the Tracks of Renewal. From the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Party Aktiv Meeting"]

[Text] A businesslike and constructive discussion of the results of, and the priority tasks outlined by, the 28th CPSU Congress was held at a party aktiv meeting of the General Staff. This brief and somewhat overly generalized formulation actually represents a huge volume of information distinguished by—I can say this without any exaggeration—profound knowledge and shared experience of the problems which are part of our country's life today. Nobody here was indifferent to whether there would be peace on earth tomorrow, whether we would

have enough of everything, what would lie in store for each and every one of us next week, next month, or next year.... This is due to, apart from all else, the fact that this is the nerve center of the country's defense. And it is only too sensitive to everything that is happening, both within the fatherland's borders and around the globe as a whole.

Having convened at a difficult time for our country and party, the 28th CPSU Congress was expected to provide answers to many questions posed by life, Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, said in his report to the meeting (he had attended the party congress as a delegate, and was elected member of the CPSU Central Committee). A joint quest for these answers took place in the course of very sharp debates. This quest was highly productive. The congress unequivocally advocated the socialist path of development. The documents it adopted revealed the main avenues of perestroyka's strategy. In the economic sphere, this means transition to market relations. It was emphasized that the party's strategy today is to boost labor efficiency and attain qualitatively new living standards for the people. The central political task is to complete political reform, transfer full power to the soviets, and help them establish themselves as organs of real power. The congress confirmed the course of shaping a democratic rule-of-law state, whose essence is rooted in the separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers, in ensuring the supremacy of law in all spheres of life.

The program statement and the special resolution defined the path of democratization of nationalities policy within a Union state's framework as the main avenue toward voluntary union, peace, and accord between the peoples. An extensive program was mapped out for solving the nationalities question. At the same time, the speaker noted, the congress took a stand against the ideology and practice of national extremism and condemned all varieties of chauvinism, Russophobia, anti-Semitism, and the propaganda and practice of national intolerance and discrimination.

Army Gen. M. Moiseyev highighted the main aspects of the party's agrarian and youth policy and of the foreign policy course directly associated with defense problems and the strengthening of the Armed Forces. He also dwelt on questions concerning the renewal of the party and of the style and methods of its activity in the new conditions which contain elements of a real multiparty system. Army and Navy communists must clearly realize, he said, that the CPSU's program goals are based—and this was confirmed by the congress—on universal human values and the communist ideal, on creative utilization of the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and on the achievements by progressive social thinking. The party sets as its task the creation of humane and democratic socialism in the country. It expresses and upholds the interests of the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, and other social strata committed to the socialist choice. The party lives and operates on the basis of community of ideological interests, party comradeship, and the principle of democratic centralism.

The party thus remains an organized force, no matter how much its opponents might resist this. It will strengthen its prestige by virtue of its realistic policy and its links with the masses. It is open to cooperation with all sociopolitical organizations on positions of the socialist choice in the struggle to attain the goals of perestroyka. These are complex conditions of life. The new and fast changing sociopolitical situation in the country demands that communists adopt a new attitude toward party membership. It is no longer excusable, as it was in the past, to just swim with the tide and do nothing but pay membership dues on time. A party membership card must indicate a clear-cut political stand. Such a stand must be capably upheld and defended.

This awareness must impart a new quality to party committees, because the CPSU already has many real opponents. We cannot overlook this, let alone expect the comfortable conditions of the past. The party has proclaimed political pluralism. This means that each communist, and especially communists in leadership positions, must master the new methodology of attitudes toward, for example, dissidence. Diktat or official pressure in work with personnel are impermissible. Only profound and sincere beliefs, based on the foundation of knowledge, extensive cultural background, and multifaceted erudition, will help to strengthen mutual understanding and will promote the elaboration of genuinely democratic mechanisms for political influence. Under no circumstances should we lose sight of the main factor—the interests of the motherland's defense.

Subjecting the state of the military-political situation and its development prospects to a comprehensive analysis, the congress declared that as long as there are no guarantees of the irreversibility of the positive changes, the military threat to the USSR persists. In these circumstances the fulfillment of constitutional duties concerning the defense of the socialist fatherland, and the strengthening and maintenance of the country's defense capability and security at the level of reliable and reasonable sufficiency has been and remains one of the most important tasks of the party and state. Consequently, exceptional sociopolitical importance is attached today to military labor. Its honorable nature and the fact that it is beloved among the people as labor involving special complexity and utmost selflessness are the fundamental guarantees of success in the patriotic and international education of USSR citizens. But this activity also demands different approaches and the elaboration of qualitatively new mechanisms, methods, and methodology.

The speaker dwelled in detail on the problems of military reform, especially the radical perestroyka of the system of party-political work in the Armed Forces. And all t s

runs along the tracks of renewal—the transformation of structures, the specification of functions, and the attainment of a new level not just in intraparty relations but also in the new moral atmosphere in military collectives, an atmosphere which ought to promote the enhancement of discipline, law and order, and comradeship among troops. Numerous questions have already arisen, to which the all-Army party conference ought to provide answers. It seems, however, that it is necessary—without awaiting decisions from the top—to embark right away on the elaboration of possible changes in the structure of party organizations in association with the forthcoming formation of a General Staff party committee and the definition of its functions, composition, election rules, and so on.

Emphasizing this, Army Gen. M. Moiseyev asked party organization secretaries to accumulate as many ideas and proposals from rank-and-file communists as possible. The discussion of precongress documents in primary party organizations demonstrated the existence of a tremendous potential of political creativity among General Staff communists indicating that people here are willing and able to generate ideas. For example, the overwhelming majority of proposals by Armed Forces communists who spoke in units, combined units, and directly in General Staff party organizations during the precongress discussion of drafts were incorporated in the party forum's documents and resolutions. Now it is a question of implementing the adopted decisions. The unity of the overwhelming majority that was achieved during the congress must be consolidated and enhanced by means of daily painstaking work with all who waver or have doubts. A direct confrontation with such communists will be of no help to consolidation. Ability to listen to and heed opponents, to find points of collaboration, and not to yield positions of principle—this is the priority task of the day.

Party congress decisions in the past had the effect of directives in the state. Now we are talking about positions for the consolidation of all constructive forces. This is the policy. It must be understood by perceiving its innermost essence, and it must be brought to each and every one. The implementation of this policy and of all congress decisions and resolution will require a really cohesive, organized, and persistent struggle. Many of the documents' provisions will have to be implemented through the adoption of corresponding laws, government resolutions, and our own decisions.

The paramount condition here is this: We must strengthen to the utmost ties with the people, the local party organizations, and soviets at all levels. Bluntly speaking, the speaker noted, the solution of problems accumulated regarding provision of apartments for the officers corps, work on military-patriotic education of the population and especially of young people, their preparation for Army service, the mobilization training of reservists, and so on will depend to a significant extent on the overcoming of shortcomings in our ties with local authorities, the deputies corps, the labor collectives, and the local party aktiv.

A huge amount of work will have to be done directly by communists in leadership positions who are called upon to actively pursue the party policy. From communists in leadership positions to rank-and-file party members... From the one to the other. This chain must be unbroken. Only then will each communist in his workplace be able to effectively struggle for the party's political leadership.

I deem it necessary to dwell on a most important question concerning the statutes, the speaker said. The new party statutes give primary party organizations major rights and autonomy in determining specific plans for their activity. But it is also important to bear in mind that autonomy presupposes greater responsibility for each step in autonomous work and its results. Consequently, primary party organizations in the General Staff will also rise to a qualitatively new level of work with due consideration for specific features. It would probably be useful for every party organization to elaborate its own action program in these conditions.

Army Gen. M. Moiseyev gave an analysis of the military-political situation in the world, and described the state of affairs concerning various aspects of the General Staff's foreign policy activity, linking these assessments with the immediate prospects for communists' work in directorates and departments.

Unquestionably, he said, political decisions and accords largely determine the course of events, but they do not relieve us of the responsibility for the present-day state of the country's defense. We are military men and we must display realism, a well-considered approach, and restraint in our assessments. After all, a realistic view of the development of events indicates that after the withdrawal of our troops from a united Germany (and this is a foregone conclusion) the strategic position of our Armed Forces will become more complex.

For all intents and purposes, the NATO border will run along the Oder River which forces us right now to implement all measures concerning defense within the borders of the USSR. While NATO leaders are assigning the main role in the European security system to their alliance, and while there is talk of maintaining and strengthening NATO as a military-political organization, incorporating a united Germany moreover, we cannot take the view that the military danger to the USSR has disappeared. This view received the backing of the party congress.

The report then went on to express—as did the speeches by communists Colonel General Yu. Yashin, who was a congress delegate; Colonel A. Krivolapov; Lieutenant General V. Mironov; Colonel M. Rubtsov; Major General A. Litvinov; Colonel A. Chebykin; Lieutenant General V. Shtepa; and Major General V. Kuklev—specific proposals for the solution of pressing problems in the conditions of the defensive doctrine's implementation

with due consideration for the creation of the Soviet Armed Forces' new image; that is, ensuring the planning and actual withdrawal of our troops from East European countries, providing local facilities for them, fully solving the social questions, amplifying plans for combat readiness and operational and combat training, organizing anew the system of command and communications, mobilization readiness and conscription, and training reservists in the new conditions of the transition to different economic management methods.

These complex tasks will have to be solved in close collaboration with local party and soviet organs. The speed with which new methods will be developed in this collaboration will determine the results of the implementation of the 28th party congress directives. Either a real renewal, or back to words and slogans.

Moiseyev Remarks on New Military Encyclopedia

LD2407230290 Moscow TASS in English 2244 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow July 25 TASS—The first volume of the second edition of the Soviet military encyclopedia was issued by the military publishing house of the USSR Defence Ministry.

The eight-volume encyclopedia has a circulation of 100,000 copies. The publication of the last volume is scheduled for mid 1990s.

The second edition is published under the guidance of the editorial commission headed by General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

"The need to publish the second edition was prompted by the significant change in human knowledge and approaches to considering all areas of society's life," Moiseyev told TASS.

He noted that the encyclopedia was published at a turning point in the country's history, in the years of revolutionary renewal and restructuring of Soviet society. "The new political thinking in issues of war and peace, which dictates the need for the defensive nature of militry doctrines, disarmament and the priority of human values in inter-state relations, has become a reality," Moiseyev stressed.

According to Moiseyev, these circumstances and also drastic changes in all areas of the military matter exerted the decisive influence on the formation of a new concept of the Soviet military encyclopedia and its content.

"In the second edition of the encyclopedia we intend to consider the remarks and proposals made after the publication of the first edition," Moiseyev said.

Military Aviation Firm Holds Open Day

PM2407085590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Colonel A. Andryushkov: "Children Through the Gates, or Open Day at Top-Secret Soviet Aviation Firm"]

[Excerpts] If someone had told me that you could visit the territory of the P.O. Sukhoy Experimental Design Bureau without spending a long time filling in documents for official bodies, I would have just smiled at the joke. Everything that happened inside the gates of the enterprise was a carefully kept secret.

There is no such thing as miracles, people say, but they do happen. On its 50th anniversary the Soviet aviation firm held an open day. This was an unprecedented event. Children were granted the right to enter the experimental workshops—the design bureau's holy of holies. [passage omitted]

I wanted to ask Mikhail Petrovich Simonov about how the idea of opening the doors of the design bureau arose. I did not manage to meet the general designer, but one of his deputies, V. Babak, chief designer of the Su-25 ground-attack aircraft, answered this question.

"Making a secret of everything is our common ailment," Vladimir Petrovich said. "What is even worse is that we tried to conceal our achievements from our own people for a long time, for fear of a leak of information abroad. We need hundreds of talented young specialists. There are none. Where are they to come from? But do you see how children are looking at their parents today? They are the future of our experimental design bureau! Mikhail Petrovich took it upon himself to open its doors to visitors in honor of the firm's 50th anniversary, and I think that this is the best way to remember Pavel Osipovich Sukhoy, the founder of the experimental design bureau. I stress that openness does not mean divulging secrets. For example, we are showing the Su-27 to the whole world, and the Australian and Singapore air forces have flown in it."

[Andryushkov] Vladimir Petrovich, your design bureau has been working on military equipment since 1940. But, as far as I am aware, this is not all that the design bureau does...

[Babak] Are you talking about conversion? I would say this: Long before this word became fashionable, the P.O. Sukhoy Experimental Design Bureau produced a mass of output for the national economy. We developed refrigerators, washing machines, and high-speed launches for river and sea use and produced them at series-production aviation plants, and a unique medical "artificial heart" apparatus was created by the designers along with many, many other things. Combat aircraft make up less than 50 percent of our production...

[Andryushkov] It is known that the design bureau is developing cooperation with foreign firms...

[Babak] Quite true. For example, our design bureau, together with the "Hydrofoil Central Design Bureau" science and production association, headed by Viktor Vasilyevich Sokolov, is organizing a surface-effect vehicle construction firm in Singapore. [passage omitted]

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 24 Jul Council Session

Draft Enterprise Law Debated

LD2407092890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 24 July begins broadcasting a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

It is announced that plenary sessions will be held on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week. The parliament will work until the 31 July. During this period, many draft laws will have to be adopted, especially those concerning the economic and social restructuring of the republic. Political decisions will have to be made, too. Debates will be held on the proposed heads of working groups in the commission for political, legal, and diplomatic preparation for negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The first item on the agenda for the day's session is the draft law on registration of enterprises and other legal bodies, which is presented by Deputy Antanavicius.

At 0718 GMT deputies put questions to Antanavicius concerning the draft law. Several stress the urgency of having enterprises registered.

At 0738 GMT a vote is taken on the decision to set up a group of editors to work on this draft.

At 0741 GMT it is announced that the remains of Jonas-Pranas Aleksa, minister of agriculture for independent Lithuania before World War II, have been brought back from Tomsk Oblast, where he died in Stalin's gulag camps. Aleksa will be buried in Palanga.

At 0743 GMT discussion begins on the second item on the day's agenda: Urgent measures for improving the living standards of retired people. This issue is being presented for the first time. Many deputies express their concern about the money that must be found for this purpose. Deputy S. Razma asks if any compensation or pension will be given to those who were victims of the Chernobyl accident.

At 0815 GMT Deputy Rudys makes a report on the next agenda item: The draft law on the composition of the budget of the republic of Lithuania. Some deputies ask Rudys about payments into the USSR budget which, according to the draft, should be terminated beginning with the next financial year.

At 0826 GMT the session is adjourned until 0900 GMT. Other items on the agenda which should be discussed during the first part of the day are: The length of annual holidays for workers and employees of the republic, the Supreme Council decision on personal homesteads for people living in rural areas, and the draft amendment on the corrective labor code of the republic of Lithuania.

Budget Discussed

LD2407112290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 24 July resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. Deputy Maslauskas takes the floor to report on the general response by the population and organizations that took part in the discussion of the draft law after it was published in the press. He says that proposals suggesting that the budget should be formed according to the principle of centralization, as it has been since Stalin's time, were rejected by the authors of the draft. The main principle of the formation of the budget is to decentralize it: Local budgets and the republic's state budget are to be formed independently.

At 0914 GMT Maslauskas ends his report and begins taking deputies' questions.

At 0936 GMT a debate on the issue ensues, with Deputy Kruopas taking the floor to present his point of view on the draft. The trouble, he says, is that many problems that should have been solved by the government have not been resolved yet, which makes the selection of the best way to formulate the budget rather difficult. He continues: Already it should be clear what taxes will have to be paid in the next financial year, the amount of tax, and which budget the tax will be paid into. If this cannot be done, then adopting the law on the formulation of the budget is premature and should be set aside until other political and social issues have been solved. Kruopas says that this is the opinion of parliament's Financial Commission.

At 0944 GMT Deputy Vagnoris takes the floor, speaking primarily about the significance of local budgets, for local governments to be autonomous in real terms. He supports the idea expressed in the draft that the budget of the republic of Lithuania should be separate from the USSR budget.

At 0957 GMT debates are held on one of the issues: Are local budgets to be separate from the republic budget? Some deputies voice their concern that this would change the entire concept of the economic and financial structure, which obviously was premature. Deputy Rudys says that nobody knows at the moment what taxes will be in force beginning 1 January, and therefore no one can tell which budget the revenue should go to. Special time is alloted by the speaker to several deputies in the Financial Commission for finding a solution to the problem.

At 1010 GMT debates on the issue of taxation and internal revenue are in progress. It is decided that economists should continue the debate separately and present the results after the lunch break.

At 1024 GMT Deputy Semenas presents the issue of annual paid holidays for workers and employees of the republic. He says that the government should be entrusted with the task of preparing a draft law on

annual paid holidays. These should not be shorter than 24 working days, and the workers and employees should not work longer than 40 hours per week. At the moment, it is 41 hours, which makes people work one Saturday a month to compensate for it.

At 1040 GMT the session is adjourned until 1200 GMT.

Tax Structure Discussed

LD2407143590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 24 July is unmonitorable. Reception improves at 1240 GMT, with debates in progress on the republican and local budgets. Lithuanian Finance Minister Sikorskis, is present at the session, answering deputies' questions. Deputy Ramons voices his concern that adopting the draft law on the formation of the budget before the law on taxation has been adopted is impossible. Deputies agree with this, saying that first setting up the principles for formulating the budget and then looking for ways of filling it with money is carrying out the task backwards.

At 1248 GMT debates on the subject continue. Deputy Rudys calls on the deputies to vote in favor of radical reforms in the formulation of local government budgets, giving the local governments greater power. Deputy Rudys says that since this is an issue of paramount importance, he demands that a vote be taken by name. He says that if the local government budgets are formed under the strict control of the Ministry of Finance and according to the same taxation levels all over the republic, then some areas will become rich while others become poor, because some areas already are rather deprived.

At 1259 GMT a rollcall vote is taken on the following issue: All local authorities will have to pay the same amount of tax on their revenue; local governments will pay tax defined by a special code designed by the Ministry of Finance and the government. The current needs of individual local governments will be taken into consideration.

At 1305 GMT while the ballot papers are being counted, K. Antanavicius makes a short report on the principles of the economic reform. These principles have already been discussed by several commissions and the cabinet, including the Supreme Council of the republic. There are two main issues: ways of privatization and the issue of property on land.

At 1312 GMT K. Prunskiene takes the floor to make a report on the issue. She says that one of the new ideas that has been introduced to the draft program is restricting of the state's control over the development of the economy. She says she does not want to go into a more detailed account of the improved draft, saying that the government wants to draw deputies' attention to the position adopted by the government with regard to privatization and private enterprise. Prunskiene says that currently existing working collectives will have the possibility to become shareholders and to take an active part in the managing and running of the enterprise. She also lays great emphasis on economic incentives.

However, the prime minister says, "transferring property into the care of local governments is not privatization; it is simply decentralization of state property." They claim that all property—in Kaunas city, for example,—belong to the city of Kaunas local government and not to the republic. Prunskiene says that lengthy debates will be held on the issue in order to reach a solution. She says that people in the republic obviously are not yet ready to accept privatization after 50 years of a national economy run by mere decree in a totalitarian state.

Prunskiene goes on to try and substantiate the point in the draft program that maintains that land should not be given to people, but sold to them and the revenue put toward strengthening the Lithuanian currency, which will be litas.

At 1336 GMT deputies question Prunskiene. Landsbergis asks about the legal aspects of land ownership. He says that people will have to buy land from the state, which implies that the confiscation of land 50 years ago was just and legal. Prunskiene replies that to assess the financial losses of people 50 years ago would be impossible, therefore the government is trying to solve these problems looking upon the situation from present-day reality.

At 1353 GMT the results of the rollcall vote on the principles of formulating local budgets are announced. By a majority vote, each local government will have to pay the same amount of tax, regardless of current economic and social needs of the area.

At 1400 GMT the session is adjourned for an unspecified period of time.

Reform Program Viewed

LD2407171390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1430 GMT on 24 July resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius, with Prime Minister Prunskiene answering deputies' questions concerning the general outline of the program for restructuring the republic's economy. She says that at the moment Lithuania is not able to assess all the harm and financial loss of people over 50 years ago, and to pay the people compensation.

At 1444 GMT Prunskiene continues answering questions.

At 1450 GMT the discussion on the main outline of the economic program continues.

At 1505 GMT a deputy discusses finance and credit questions. He notes state income may be held in special funds. Reference is made to the initial Sajudis finance

program, which has not been rejected to date. The need for a more defined program is cited.

At 1510 GMT Deputy Survila notes the present state of "economic ignorance." He cites lessons learned through the blockade. Survila says enterprises are faced with many uncertainties regarding future law enactment and conditions, then cites some of the questions on pricing, salaries, work schedules, budget, foreign capital and manner of dealing with enterprises submerged in deficit. The effect of reforms on agricultural workers and farmers is questioned.

At 1525 GMT Deputy Minkevicius notes the market mechanism is equipped to deal with some of the above questions—subsidies are possible. Minkevicius proposes discussion of alternative drafts. Questions of collective farm property are raised. How it should be apportioned and the question of returning citizens' property are also mentioned. Leasing complications are discussed as are questions of land reform. Norms should be set in any other way, except through market principles. Questions of which Lithuanian citizens are to be given land and how this shall be determined are posed.

At 1540 GMT Minister of Trade Albertas Sinevicius outlines three reform stages. He mentions privatization and negotiations with the USSR, as being among them. Creation of normal market conditions needs to be more definitive; there is a need to protect those in the lowest income brackets, so they would survive the reform period. Minimum wage guarantees are necessary.

At 1550 GMT a deputy notes property had been confiscated and became state property. The concept of state property may not be accurate. The question of independent relations between owner and employee is raised. A deputy also notes attention needs to be given to migration problems.

Debates Continue

LD2407202390

[Editorial Report] At 1630 GMT on 24 July reception of the live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session by Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian improves to poor.

The economic reform discussion continues. Deputy Sepetys proposes one draft be composed, from the existing three draft documents, and be presented for deliberation in the fall. He notes a single draft would not be sufficiently complete to please everyone. He cites the need to make people aware of benefits provided through taxes, as opposed to previous taxation, without any resultant benefits.

At 1645 GMT Deputy Vagnorius takes the floor, criticizing lack of trust among deputies. Deputy Andrulevicius cites the need to start the privatization process with production privatization.

At 1655 GMT deputies discuss return of property taken over by the state, compensation for property, agricultural, as well as industrial. A deputy discusses currency problems: new currency will reflect economy, it may or may not be stronger than the ruble.

At 1705 GMT the discussion on economic reform continues, as do questions on currency.

At 1715 GMT reference is made to a list of questions proposed last week by Professor Antanavicius. A proposal is made to enumerate and discuss these questions.

Next, Deputy Baldisis discusses restructuring of the banking system. He stresses the opinion of a group of experts on the importance of the immediate issue of a currency for Lithuania. He expresses regret that this proposal is not being sufficiently heeded.

At 1720 GMT a deputy is heard noting that economic questions are being discussed with increasing frequency, but economic reform is lacking. He notes that such discussions do not constitute serious work. Professional economists need to busy themselves at economic instutites. He sees decentralization as the most important task.

At 1730 GMT economic program discussion continues. Agrarian reform and collective farm privatization are discussed. The question of defining debt exemptions is raised.

At 1735 GMT questions on privatization proposals and foreign investment dependency are mentioned. The need for clarification of draft proposals to make them understandable is suggested. Doubts are expressed about the meaning of draft terminology.

At 1745 GMT arguments regarding social security provisions ensues. Deputy Cepaitis notes privatization has had a long history in Lithuania. He cites the return to privatization is a protest to aggression and confiscation of property by the Soviet system. All citizens should be safeguarded to be afforded equal chance to property rights.

At 1750 GMT Prime Minister Prunskiene notes the existing variants are alternatives. She notes government could not have had a complete program, in view of uncertainty of the entire situation. Real reform should not be copied from a foreign country with the use of a translated text—this could be accomplished in a month.

It is noted a plenary session will continue on 26 July at 0700 GMT.

At 1800 GMT the live relay concludes.

Prunskiene Addresses 24 Jul Council Session

LD2507003690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1312 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Report by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene at the 24 July Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] This document [which has been presented for discussion] has been prepared using all rationally expressed opinions and forming, at the same time, a unified position conceptually speaking. It is not an alternative to a definite variant, such as you had last Tuesday [17 July], but a developed variant, including some features that were either not yet included in the text or have been corrected in the course of discussions, and having at that time agreed with the unified concept, have now been included in this present altered variant.

What then has been altered here and what has been clarified as compared to the earlier one? We are going to direct our attention to a feature to the effect that a paragraph has been introduced there limiting the state's regulatory role and that, as you see, is a preamble to [word indistinct].

There is also an important feature there that has been mentioned by esteemed Antanavicius. However, during the course of discussions it became clear in its exactness. Along with the most basic denationalization and privatization method transfer—transfer, a possibility has been introduced to apply investment goals that integrate as an advantage—which integrate compensation for losses, that is, of both property and unearned income; that is to say, low income, which provides opportunities for individuals to start small businesses for those who do not have other means or means to acquire a share, which also removes certain psychological attitudes against private economy, because this type of opportunity is provided for everyone. [sentence as heard] It also increases common, let us say, harmony.

At the same time, with regard to sales as the basic method, this also does not upset the normal commercial approach to denationalization and privatization, and only unites those two things. I think this is also important in seeking national harmony, as well as in currently integrating the so-called Union economy, or the Union enterprises, into Lithuanian unified [word indistinct] scene; to reinforce that same decision with respect to the people who work there. [passage omitted]

Very many motives can be found for use of investment [word indistinct] as a unique way which suits Lithuania's special circumstances, but if the desire for discussion needs to be expanded, we can then do that. This is described very briefly in the document you have before you today.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that in this document we have clearly stated our position regarding the nature of denationalization and that is done according to the plan. The state is a private individual. Thus, state enterprises are being transformed into private ones, or the state is a private individual, further, a group of private individuals, thus joint stock companies or economic associations are being formed. In the meantime, the principle which is being widely discussed in Lithuania—without naming its essence and it is very widespread in the Soviet Union within its reform concepts, its economic reform concepts, which we after all consider atypical, that is, the principle of the state as a labor collective. It contains a sufficiently large amount of populism and Soviet ideology. Thus, this feature is also explained and it has a very practical significance, as when we discuss by what means a joint stock company or an economic association comes into being in place of the currently existing state or state cooperative enterprises. This has a meaning in forming a definite mechanism of denationalization and privatization. It constitutes its principal statute. [passage omitted]

In other words, we are attempting to introduce more and more criteria into the denationalization and privatization mechanism. This will, first of all, protect the individual from possible risk and will create as many as possible conditions for [words indistinct] [passage omitted]

For instance, we cannot now at the inception of reform promote some force-induced phenomena that would induce an individual to choose this not of his own free will—not of his own free will. Economic motivations must be matured and an impulse must be given to beget such economic, and finally, such social motivations. There must not be any collectivization in reverse. This would lead to Stalinism in reverse. [passage omitted]

Problems do exist and will continue to with respect to local government property. [passage omitted] For the time being long explanation sessions are in the offing. [passage omitted] For this reason, at the very beginning of economic reform, it will be necessary to differentiate, very accurately, government and local government competencies in deciding property questions, and further, in deciding on denationalization and privatization of both levels, or Lithuania's in general, state property questions. [passage omitted] It would be a miracle, probably unheard of, if we could succeed in accomplishing this [reform] in a few years. World experience fails to support this. [passage indistinct] Thus, whether we like it or not, we must—that is, it is necessary to evaluate the opportunities, to evaluate the facts. The mentality of the people and their very participation must be supported. That, constitutes reform. However, [word indistinct] to adopt documents and to establish institutions, that is, to carry out denationalization, that other side must be prepared to go to the private [word indistinct]. Moreover, for this, very patient and long [word indistinct] will be needed. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Delegation Arrives in Moscow

LD2507122990 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 25 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow July 25 TASS—A Lithuanian parliamentary delegation, led by Ceslovas-Vytautas Stankyavicus, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, arrived in Moscow today.

Stankyavicus told TASS that the delegation consists of members of the commission for consultations with the Russian Federation, set up by a resolution of the republican Supreme Soviet.

The delegation is expected to meet Ruslan Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soivet, in line with an agreement reached during his recent visit to Lithuania. Participants in the consultations will seek "to define areas to be covered by future agreements and to begin preparations for them."

According to Stankyavicus, trade, economic, cultural and other ties have special urgency for both sides.

In addition to the commission members, Stankyavicus said, the group also comprises two Lithuanian deputy ministers of foreign affairs who will meet Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Komplektov. Among the problems on the agenda is the issue of "border control," Stankyavicus said.

Lithuania's Kuzmickas on Talks With Moscow

LD2507083390 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] Negotiations between Lithuania and the USSR can begin next month after guidelines have been formulated for a Lithuanian delegation going to Moscow.

The vice president of Lithuania, Broniclovas Kuzmickas, has said in an interview with INTERFAX that the basic political instructions will be to reach agreement on the recognition of Lithuania's independence.

In Moscow, Kuzmickas emphasized, a fundamental treaty should be signed first for Lithuania and the USSR to maintain their relations as two independent states and only then it will be possible to sign economic cooperation accords. However, he did not rule out that the Soviet Army might stay on the territory of Lithuania.

Prunskiene Interviewed on Moscow Talks

LD2407190590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Video report by correspondent A. Paulyus from the 24 July session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, including interview with Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, from the "Vremya" newscast—live]

[Text] [Paulyus] The issue of talks is not included in the session's agenda every day; nevertheless, it is constantly in the air, so to speak. Many of the problems that are being discussed at parliamentary meetings are linked with it to a varying degree. Today, for example, the decision on implementing a provisional law on compulsory state defense was published. There are many views and opinions about the talks, and not only at the top, but also at rallies, meetings, and in the press.

[Prunskiene] I think that the talks should be started as soon as possible. The Lithuanian Supreme Council seems to be ready to complete preparatory work as soon as this week. The Supreme Council commission, which is now examining all documents as well as the creation of groups of experts, should, on the whole, conduct active work in this field. We have submitted both—that is, the groups of experts, too.

[Paulyus] The parliament will be on vacation from 1 August.

[Prunskiene] Yes, and I think that we should form a delegation and make arrangements about the talks before that, if we do not manage to actually start the talks.

[Paulyus] Did you speak about the talks with Union leadership during you latest visit to Moscow?

[Prunskiene] Yes, I had an opportunity to speak with President Gorbachev. We may state that both sides' positions seem to be drawing together.

Lithuanian Views of Talks With Moscow Examined

PM2407132790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 Second Edition p2

[Article by Yu. Stroganov under the rubric "Subjective Remarks": "To Common Sense"]

[Text] Vilnius—Think how anticipation can be joyful but sometimes the exact opposite—agonizing—because of the uncertainty involved. A meeting or separation, a long voyage, an examination.... It is impossible to list all those instances in life, but the anticipation produced by the "Lithuanian situation" has few analogies. The republic's entire population is in a state of anticipation. Anticipation of their hopes being realized. But, because of the uncertainty of the future, this anticipation is an uneasy experience.

What will the dialogue between Moscow and Vilnius lead to? What lies ahead of the republic? What direction will the country's development take? And what will it give to ordinary people?

People have different hopes, some mutually exclusive, just as they have different ideas on the country's development. Even the anticipation produces different effects. In some it gives rise to associations like S. Dali's surrealist painting "Premonition of Civil War." In others, romantic, philosophical reflection evoked by the canvases of M.K. Ciurlionis. Others breath the ringing

air of approaching change of one of Savrasov's spring landscapes. And others, feeling uneasy, simply wait: What will be will be. This kind of anticipation is doubly agonizing. Evidently our being is programmed to activity, and any kind of inactivity is unnatural to it. "Waiting and being overtaken is worst of all." Consequently, quite a few people are being active while in their state of anticipation. They are making their views clear and taking an active part in the work of social organizations. They are trying to influence the course of events, if only by making their own, personal point of view public.

... Where will the dialogue between Moscow and Vilnius lead? We are waiting to see.... But, essentially, the talking began long ago. Social groups and leaders are exchanging opinions: in debates, in the press, on radio and television. Of course, this talking cannot lead to the drafting of political documents but it probably can influence public opinion and, consequently, the results of those long-awaited, real talks. Although some still try to shout down their opponent on the model of the [medieval] Novgorod Council, sober voices are nevertheless more characteristic of the present state of anticipation in Lithuania. No, none of the representatives of the opposing forces have changed their views or passions. Neither the "supporters," nor the "opposers," nor the "centrists," which is what they all sometimes consider themselves to be.... But the majority, in my view, are beginning to realize the truth: namely, that dialogue is needed. A calm, unharrowing discussion, setting out of positions, and arguments that anticipate joint conclusions. We have hurled about enough accusations, denunciations, and epithets....

I can remember how at a thousands-strong rally in Vingis Park I felt alarm, seeing just how strong the influence of emotions is and how quickly many sober-minded people succumb to them. But even during those moments I was not wrong in thinking that sooner or later sober reasoning would gain the upper hand in decent people. I do not mean that a person should abandon his principles but that he should abandon excessive emotions.

The stakes are too high—our future and the future of our children—and that is why giving into emotions is too dangerous. As far as other people's principles are concerned, even if "your opinion is deeply inimical to me, I am ready to sacrifice my own life for your right to express it." Those were the thoughts of the great Voltaire. As wise as life itself. Life needs truth alone: A lie is like dead flesh. And truth is born in argument—that is to say, in dialogue.

It quite often happens that different groups have objectives that are close in essence, but their different ideas on the means of achieving those objectives create the impression that their objectives are different. The reverse is also true: Good objectives are declared, but, judging by the means employed to attain them, the real intentions are actually different.

In the real political situation of today, you have to work on the basis of the corresponding political realities. Whether you like a force or not, you have to reckon with it—there is nothing you can do about it. Naturally, only if it deserves to be reckoned with. I mainly see the latter as being reflected in popular support. It is no accident that of the dozens of groups and parties active in Lithuania, only a handful are really active faces on the republic's political scene. "Sajudis," the Lithuanian Communist Party (loyal to the CPSU), the Social Democrats, the reorganized Lithuanian Communist Party, and, perhaps, the citizens' committees. I do not claim to be making any revelations. This is simply my own, personal view of reality. Of course, the opinion of other groups is also considered in the arrangement of forces. But in real life they do not play a very significant role at present. In any case, they are not very active in the agonizing process of waiting and so they are not very much in evidence. On the other hand, those in favor of sober thinking are becoming increasingly evident.

You increasingly often hear statements which cannot be gainsaid, so to speak, and which prompt reflection rather than a rush of blood to the eyes. Their value lies in the fact that they apply to all mankind and not just to a narrow few. Doctor of Economic Sciences K. Antanavicius, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Standing Commission on the Economy, said: "... Some of our compatriots threatened self-immolation if a moratorium was adopted. Is it really worth leaping into the flames for the sake of claims and ambitions like these? Surely those who adopted the moratorium did not wish their country evil? We must look for ways to help people rather than collect petitions against supporters of talks with the Kremlin. We cannot reorient our economy without the market to the East." G. Vagnolius, deputy chairman of the economic commission, said: "The development of the situation in Lithuania also largely depends on the success of reform in the USSR. That is the nature of our ties today: They should be neither understated nor overstated." V. Gerasionis, chairman of the "Vilnius" Furniture Combine Trade Union Committee, said: "The path to the working people's hearts and minds and to their national and social aspirations lies in consistent struggle for their rights and interests and in daily concern for their needs. Social justice is the main buttress of stability in the most direct sense of this word."

I can hear the outcry now: People will say that I have dug up a few chance statements in the press. But are they just a few chance statements? If they are constantly popping up in various newspapers, they are already a pattern and the expression of definite social groups' opinions. Yes, economists' view of the situation is now really sober and prudent. Pragmatic, if you like. It is dictated by the economy itself. And the latter cannot be uninternational.

There are also a considerable number of examples of sober thinking among the creative intelligentsia. Professor C. Kudaba, a well known Lithuanian scientist, said: "... We are really deluding ourselves if we believe

that everything will be solved by reviving the genuine values of the past and implanting them in the present, sometimes resorting to artificial restoration in this respect. To all appearances, we underestimate the threat of possibly finding ourselves in the sterile isolation of our own national culture, which leads to the spiritual provinces.... That is why it is both important and necessary, as we stand at the source of a new life, to open ourselves to world culture and be drawn into the heart of its varied colors and voices as well as to revive our own national culture."

I asked the writer R. Sadauskas to give his attitude to the complex situation in which we now find ourselves.

"I feel optimistic about the situation," he said. "All the conditions exist for Lithuania and other republics to live in peace and cooperate. After all, our cultures and economies are closely interwoven. We cannot get away from one another. I think that compromise and accord are perfectly feasible. We have to cast our pride aside. We cannot live in this difficult moral climate. People must live and work in peace. The conflict that is happening now is largely artificial, to my mind. In any case, I do not see it as a conflict between peoples. I have quite a lot of readers in the Soviet Union. Our excellent relations are still intact. There can be conflict in any family. The only way to resolve it is to compromise."

But while the participants in the talks feel their way toward difficult compromise, perhaps we should agonize less as we wait and more actively conduct our own dialogue?

I questioned M. Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (loyal to the CPSU) Central Committee and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

"There is enough confrontation and antagonism between political forces in our country. These processes are exacerbated in Lithuania. But we must try to find the way to accord if we are going to get life back to normal. What do you see as the solution to the situation in the republic?"

"Of course, we need a dialogue and need to seek ways to accord," Mikolas Martinovich said. "We have put forward the idea of a 'roundtable' in this situation. The nature of these talks would be to gather all representatives of groups trying to restore normal relations between the republic and the central government and normal life in Lithuania. We think that representatives of workers, the kolkhoz [collective farm] peasantry, the people's intelligentsia, the reorganized Lithuanian Communist Party, the moderate wing of 'Sajudis,' the Socialist Federation of Working People, the Social Democrats, Lithuanian citizens' committees, the 'Yedinstvo' international movement, trade unions, the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], and other orgranizations, and also representatives of all nationalities living in Lithuania, could take part in the work of this 'roundtable.' We are categorically opposed to any displays of sectarianism in the activity of the Lithuanian Communist Party (loyal to the CPSU). We need dialogue...."

Dialogue will lead to a clarification of positions. Consideration of each others' arguments will lead to the truth. Active anticipation will lead to common sense and accord....

A USSR delegation has been formed for the talks. The republic is also preparing itself. A difficult, bumpy road lies ahead of it. But it must get the better of it....

Minister Coordinates Moscow Treaty Principles

LD2407223690 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Lithuania's home minister [minister of internal affairs] [word indistinct] visited Moscow to coordinate basic principles of the treaty with the Soviet Union Home Ministry.

Commenting on the visit, Home Minister Marijonas Misiukonis said that it would be a treaty of professional cooperation on parity basis avoiding political problems.

Oil-Shale Mining Damages Estonian Environment

LD2407120690 Tallinn International Service in English 2030 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Excerpts] In an area of about 1,000 square miles in the northeastern part of Estonia, just across from Finland, disasters sure to shock anyone who sees them come one after another. In the city of Kohtla-Jarve, red bubbling extracts from oil-shale processing plants, run untreated into the Baltic Sea. In Narva, a major city near the border with Russia, power plants spew tons of radioactive debris from soaring smokestacks. In Kunda, towers at an antiquated cement plant pump heavy white ash into the air, which then falls onto surrounding houses and trees like a heavy snow. In and around the city of Tapa, some of the well water is contaminated with fuel.

Ironically, by far the biggest source of the pollution comes from Estonia's greatest natural resource, which under Soviet rule has become its greatest environmental curse. That resource is oil shale. [passage omitted]

Since the Soviet military takeover of Estonia in 1940, uses and methods have changed. Today under the total control of central authorities in Moscow, over 31 million tonnes of shale is mined each year, almost eight times the amount mined during Estonia's independence. [passage omitted]

The result of Soviet methods is waste and devastation. [passage omitted]

Frequently, the heavy toxic residues has to be run out directly to nearby rivers, or is incompletely treated and then pumped out to sea. [passage omitted]

Over all, half of the 30 million tonnes of shale mined each year ends up on the grounds as inorganic residue. Of the electricity generated in the process half goes to fulfill all of Estonia's energy needs. The rest goes to Russia, Latvia, and Belorussia. Some of the electricity is even sold to Finland for hard currency. Estonia, however, gets nothing of the hard currency revenue. Because of senseless all-Union accounting systems, Estonia also ends up getting paid less by Moscow for the electricity it produces here than it actually costs Estonia to produce it. In short, Estonia is forced to subsidize the destructive and inefficient energy industry over which it has no control. [passage omitted]

For the steep monetary and environmental costs of producing the third largest per capital amount of electricity in the world, just behind Norway and Canada, Estonia gets comparatively nothing in return. Moreover, because the inefficient use of the shale to produce electricity requires that such massive quantitites of shale be mined each year, the Soviets are quickly depleting the once-rich shale reserve. At the present rate of mining, the shale deposits that could have provided Estonia a source of hard currency on the world market and kept Estonia energy self-sufficient for years, will be gone in 25 years.

Repeal of Moscow Cartel in Estonia Demanded

LD2407100190 Tallinn International Service in English 2030 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] On 2 July, Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin signed a decree joining all Estonia-based Moscow subordinated enterprises into a cartel under direct control of the Soviet Government. The cartel, which was founded by local Russian plant managers who feared the loss of their pr ·ileged status in Estonia, would stand completely apart from the Estonian economic, legislative, and financial systems. The potential members of the cartel comprise 59 percent of the capital stock of Estonia, 33 percent of the production (?plant), and account for 29 percent of commodity output.

In a detailed analysis of this plan published in local dailies last week, Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar said that creating a Moscow controlled cartel of all Union enterprises based in Estonia means setting up alternative power structures and undermines Estonia's integrity. The cartel would be an extra territorial system that the Estonian government could in no way control, making Estonia's economic development practically impossible, said Edgar Savisaar in his analysis.

The prime minister called on the Soviet Government to repeal the decree on setting up the cartel as it violates the Soviet law on the Baltic republics' economic autonomy and obstructs economic reform in Estonia.

Patriarch Aleksiy Meets Estonian Leaders

90UN2338A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by Leonid Levitskiy: "Patriarch Aleksiy in Estonia: Estonian Leaders Met With Patriarch of Moscow and All-Russia Aleksiy II"]

[Text] Tallinn—On Tuesday, A. Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, received Aleksiy II and clergymen who are accompanying him. In the conversation not only religious problems were discussed, particularly the position of the Russian Orthodox Church in Estonia, but also the complex situation in the republic. The long-standing acquaintance of Aleksiy II and Arnold Ruutel contributed to the frankness of the discussion. As is known, the patriarch was born in Tallinn to a clergyman's family. Here the 17-year old youth became a psalm reader in the Simeonovskiy Church. Aleksiy's life and activity are inseparably linked with Estonia. Before his election as patriarch, he was the metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod, administering the Tallinn and Olonets eparchies and patriarchal parishes in Finland. In 1984 he was awarded a doctor of divinity degree by the Leningrad Ecclesiastical Academy. The subject of his dissertation was "An Essay on the History of Orthodoxy in Estonia."

Aleksiy II's visit to Estonia is a tribute of acknowledgement to the land for which, in his words, he will maintain gratitude and love forever.

The patriarch visited the Svyato-Uspenskiy Monastery in Pyussi and held services in the Cathedral of Aleksandr Nevskiy and in other Tallinn shrines. Aleksiy also found time for a detailed press conference.

A meeting was held on Tuesday between the patriarch and E. Savisaar, the chairman of the government of Estonia.

Estonian Party Secretary Gusev Interviewed

90UN2345A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Rusian 12 Jul 90 Single Edition p 2

[Report on interview with A.A. Gusev, secretary of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party (on the CPSU Platform), by N. Garifullina under the rubric: "In the Corridors of the Congress": "'I Want to Bow to the Communists of Russia...'"]

[Text] **The sharp political struggle that has developed in many regions during perestroyka has thrust new leaders into public orbit whose names, perhaps, are still not known to broad circles of communists throughout the country, but who, nevertheless, are known and trusted by workers and party comrades and have united in this difficult time for a joint struggle. One of this cohort of young party leaders is A.A. Gusev, secretary of the independent Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party.**

[Garifullina] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, despite the demand that was made twice from the microphone to give the floor to Gusev, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform, you still did not get it. What did you want to talk about in your speech, and what kinds of problems and anxieties did those communists who sent you want to bring before the congress?

[Gusev] Despite the fact that the congress has passed the halfway point, I think that its delegates still do not know and have not understood up until now what has happened in the Estonian Communist Party. It is clearer with the Lithuanian and Latvian Communist Parties. But we have two Communist Parties, two Central Committees, and both sides, in contrast to Lithuania and Latvia, came to the congress, and, therefore, the delegates care about how we are working, and what the prospects are...

[Garifullina] ... and on what positions one and the other party stand.

[Gusev] Exactly! Not everyone knows why there was a split. Therefore, I would like to explain that two questions of principle divided the party. The communists who represent our Central Committee and our delegation did not concur in the thesis concerning Estonia's secession from the USSR structure. We are fighting for a renewal of the federation and the broadening of the independence of the Union republics. Secondly, and the reason why we broke apart at the 20th congress, is the proposition, which is also stated in the Program, that it is necessary to strive for a union of communist parties; that is, to create a new Socialist International, or a communist one, or something like that. We could not come to an agreement on this either. We believe that communist parties of the union republics must be fully independent in deciding organizational, personnel, economic, and financial questions, but that without fail they must be within the structure of a single CPSU and, together with it, conduct a policy for the renewal of the party and the USSR. As you see, there is a divergence among us on the most fundamental positions, and I wanted the delegates of the 28th Congress to know about them. Hushing up the situation in the Estonian Communist Party will not lead to anything good.

[Garifullina] What is the arrangement of forces in the two Estonian Communist Parties?

[Gusev] After the declaration of the independent Communist Party, only 4,700 persons joined it. About 40,000 communists stayed with us. Our party is supported by the workers of large industrial regions—the northeast, Narva, Sillamyae, Kohtla-Jarve, Tallinn, etc. It was improper to hush up the true situation, because, first, it will be disclosed sooner or later anyway, and, second, and this is the main thing, we are expressing the interests of the working class.

[Garifullina] Your party unites only Russian-speaking communists?

[Gusev] In no way! Let us speak of specific facts. Out of more than 100,000 communists of the former Communist Party, approximately half were Estonians. Now the independent Communist Party has less than 5,000, and we have about 40,000, and these are people of different nationalities, and it is not correct to say that one party is Estonian and the other is Russian-speaking. Unfortunately, the political situation in the republic has a strong influence on communists, especially on Estonians, and, of course, many of them today have not taken a position. One thing can be said: There are fewer Russian-speaking communists in the independent party then there are Estonians in our party.

[Garifullina] What are the main aims of your party?

[Gusev] Speaking in the language of Lenin, we have a minimal program and a maximal program. The "maximum" or global task is to keep Estonia within the USSR structure and the Communist Party within the CPSU structure, and a socialist choice for the future development of the republic. But to execute this strategic program, it is necessary to consolidate the party, because after the 20th Congress, it proved to be devastated, having lost a large part of its membership. There are no party organizations in rural rayons. We must restore them and return confidence to the communists, and then the party will get stronger, and it will be able to work on the main problem. We are now meeting this "minimum." We reestablished municipal party organizations in the cities of Tartu, Pyarnu, and Valga. As for the northeast, we do not have to agitate there particularly: Kohtla-Jarve, Narva, and Sillamyae are our cities, and the party did not lose any positions there. Now we will go to the smaller rayon centers—Vyru, Rakvere, and others, and, I hope, that within a year we will reestablish all of our party structures all over again.

[Garifullina] Is your faction in the Estonian Supreme Soviet?

[Gusev] Yes, 26 of the 125 deputies in the parliament. This is not a lot, but it is not a little either: We almost got up to one-third. I even think that this is a definite success, because, in a complex political situation, and given the increase in anti-sovietism, anticommunism, and Russophobia, communist candidates did not hide their party affiliation during the election campaign. Appearing before the voters, we defended two main theses: Estonia in the USSR structure, and the party in a united CPSU. And the fact that we were elected, enables us to reach the conclusion: The people share this position.

As for the tactics... First, we had to learn to work. Personally, I, for example, was never a deputy, even of a local soviet, and others did not have occasion to function in such an unusual situation. We chose the method of representation in the parliament of the alternative draft. We do not argue with what another faction introduces; we propose our own and begin to consider both drafts. And although we do not succeed in defending our

proposals, we, nonetheless, have the satisfaction of fighting for those objectives and ideas which were determined by our constituents.

[Garifullina] We are receiving a lot of letters in connection with the cancellation of privileges for participants in the Great Patriotic War, and in connection with the fact that monuments for SS troops are being erected, and that on 7-9 July a rally is being planned for "veterans" of fascist divisions, and all of this aroused indignation even in the FRG, but in Estonia it is as if there is an understanding in certain circles... What do communists think of all of this?

[Gusev] I can not designate this any other way than with your word "blasphemy"—if you will recall that is the title of your April article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA about these deplorable and shameful events. One can argue and hold different views on many questions, but there can be no two opinions with respect to fascism. The Central Committee of our party and rank and file communists are deeply disturbed by these actions, and they did everything not to allow the disgraceful mob to assemble. Our faction made two announcements at the session of the republic Supreme Soviet, and 10 days ago, at the Communist Party Congress, approval was given for an appeal to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and to the President of the USSR with a demand to stop this action, because, however deplorable, we did not get support at the Supreme Soviet session. The government headed by Savisaar later came out in the press with an explanation that there seems to be nothing insulting to the people in the actions of the former SS troops, as long as they do not wear the uniform and walk in the streets with fascist banners. This is your "pluralism." But I am convinced: A majority of people, not only in Estonia and the Soviet Union, but in the whole world, will never forget the victims of fascism and will never forgive the butchers. The Estonian press and indeed the authorities say: They say that they were following orders. But, you see, the orders were being executed in a massive annihilation of people in death camps, and they were conducting reprisals against the peaceful population of the land of Novgorod, Pskov, and Belorussia, and the Baltic republics!

... We are put on guard by the fact that the announcements of both the Government of Estonia and the republic's society for the protection of ancient monuments state that the rally in question has only been postponed. Well then, we will act even more resolutely.

[Garifullina] The 28th congress is coming to an end. Do you have a feeling of satisfaction from its work, or are you still displeased with something?

[Gusev] You know, I am completely satisfied with the congress. And I am not troubled that at times there are heated and even tactless debates. I understand that the widest range of communists is represented here and that what is occurring in society is interpreted at the congress. But I get satisfaction from the fact that the main instructions that the communists gave us when delegating us to Moscow will be fulfilled. That is, we are preserving the Soviet federation, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and, as part of it, the Estonian Communist Party, and we affirmed adherence to the socialist choice. Widespread contacts with very different people gives reason for optimism: Indeed, the work ahead is gigantic, but we are on the right road for getting out of that complex situation in which the party and the country find themselves today, and there is a way out, and we will find it.

[Garifullina] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, please, a few words about yourself.

[Gusev] Today, "fighters against the party" like to state that party functionaries are fighting only for their own privileges. Thus, perhaps, my fate and the fate of those like me, will help the reader to become convinced that this is far from the truth. I am not a professional party worker, and I was never in the leading organs of the party. In 1974, I graduated from the Kuybyshev Aviation Institute as an electronics specialist, I arrived in Estonia on a job assignment, and not in order to seek some kind of benefits, with which they like to reproach us Russian speakers. I worked in an electronics association for 16 years, going through all of the stages from engineer-designer of a design bureau to general director.

A year and a half ago, in a difficult political situation, communists, basically from the work collectives of the city of Tallinn, elected me first secretary of the republic's largest—Morskoy Raykom [rayon party committee] in the capital of Estonia. It was not easy for me to decide to take this step, but as an individual and as an administrative manager accustomed to analyzing, I could not fail to foresee the development of events. The fate of communists and those enterprise collectives where we worked depended on my decision. I made a choice. At the 20th congress I was elected secretary of the independent Central Committee. So that it is difficult for them to accuse me of belonging to the "party bureaucracy and partocracy" (the favorite labels of the populists), but, perhaps, therein lies my strength.

[Garifullina] The recently held Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR was assessed almost identically by many organs of the press: reactionary, conservative, anti-perestroyka, and antidemocratic. And these are by far not all of the epithets from a wide range of critics. But how do you assess the fact of the creation of a Russian Communist Party? Will you cooperate with it, or will you be put off by the labels?

[Gusev] Let us remember this, and it would do no harm if many respected politicians and journalists remembered this. When the initiative congress was just convening in Moscow and in Leningrad, the press, you see, did not criticize it, and everyone wrote: Indeed, Russia needs a Communist Party and a Central Committee. Why then did the furious attacks start after the Constituent Congress? How familiar this is! Many of our pseudo

democrats were counting on the fact that a Communist Party of Russia would be organized at the congress, but not within the structure of the CPSU. But imagine, what if this happened suddenly and the strongest element would withdraw from the CPSU, then it simply would cease to exist as a party and as a force. The pseudo democrats hoped that, without the cementing force of the CPSU, the dissolution of the USSR would begin then and there. But, then, when this did not happen, when the communists of Russia realized their historical responsibility before the peoples of the entire country and proclaimed their party in a united CPSU, it was after this that the "enough" began. I had this idea for the speech that was not heard at the congress. I would like to bow deeply before the communists of Russia as they did not fall for this provocation. Convey to them our gratitude through the newspaper!

Draft Treaty on Union, Latvian Relations Viewed

PM2407153990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Irina Litvinova under the rubric "Direct Line": "Government Program Submitted"]

[Text] Riga—Latvia's Supreme Soviet has begun discussing the government program for developing the republic's economy submitted by Ivars Godmanis, chairman of the Council of Ministers.

The government program provides for the gradual introduction of commodity-money relations and a transition to a market. Quotas for imports and exports of goods, its own monetary system, and perestroyka of the activity of the republic customs service are to protect the republic's internal commodity market. The government proposes to privatize 25-30 percent of the national wealth (not counting land and natural resources) over the next four-five years by using the funds of the republic's inhabitants and of foreign private capital. Property will be sold to private persons, groups of private persons, or collectives, as well as being handed over to organs of local self-management and religious communities.

The government's prices policy will be geared to free market prices. State control over the majority of wholesale and retail prices will be abolished before the end of 1991. Subsidies for the production of agricultural produce are being eliminated.

The government program also designates foreign policy aspects of the Latvian Republic's activity. The government considers its chief task to be the de facto restoration of Latvia's independence. Attaching paramount significance to relations with the USSR, Latvia's government believes that the system of treaties between these states must include, in particular, treaties on joint borders and the border regime, on mutual economic relations, on cooperation in the fight against crime, and on the status of USSR military bases, their size, and the procedure for eliminating them in the Latvian Republic.

The draft treaty on relations between the USSR and the Latvian Republic submitted by the government aroused the deputies' great interest. Under this draft, the USSR recognizes the Latvian Republic as "an independent state within the borders defined by the peace treaty between Russia and Latvia of 11 August 1920." Property located on Latvian territory and in the possession of USSR organs and organizations as of 4 May this year (the day the Declaration of Independence was adopted) passes to the ownership of the Latvian Republic without payment within one year. This also applies to movable property—ships, aircraft, railroad trains, motor vehicles, and other objects that were on Latvian territory 4 May. The draft proposes that the Latvian Republic renounce on a mutual basis claims to property which is on USSR territory and which is Latvia's share in the total volume of USSR property. The USSR must return to Latvia the plots of land, buildings, and assets of Latvia in third countries which passed to USSR ownership in 1940. The USSR must return to the Latvian Republic within one year the historical, cultural, and material assets exported to the USSR in 1940 and subsequent years. The USSR must also pay compensation to the victims of Stalinist repressions and to their heirs who are citizens of Latvia.

No Observer Status for Baltic States at CSCE

AU2307141690 Paris AFP in English 1350 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Vienna, July 23 (AFP)—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia will not be granted observer status at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), CSCE secretariat sources said Monday.

None of the 35 member states of the CSCE (all European countries except Albania, but including the United States and Canada) has put forward the request which the three Baltic countries expressed in a document distributed to CSCE delegates last Thursday.

RSFSR

Russian Parliament Forms Human Rights Committee

LD2507085790 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 25 Jul 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow July 25 TASS—"It is impossible to protect human rights without a package of corresponding laws," according to Sergey Kovalev, who heads the Russian parliament's first-ever committee on human rights.

The 36-strong body has begun to prepare several bills on human rights protection, Kovalev told TASS.

"We place great hopes on the setting up of an institution of human rights observers in Russia," he went on.

"However, we come across a lot of human tragedies in our everyday work. Within the first fortnight of operations, we received nearly a thousand written requests from citizens and numberless phone calls. We are often asked for help by those who have doubted ever finding justice," he said.

Committee members come from various walks of life and politics. Chairman Sergey Kovalev is on the staff of an academic institute and one of the activists in the human rights movement. His deputy, Nikolay Arzhannikov is a former militia officer, and the committee secretary is engineer Stanislav Shustov.

Tasks of RSFSR Economic Council Described

904A0485A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN in Russian No 28, Jul 90 p 4

[Interview with R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN correspondent Yu. Yakutin; place and date not given: "The Supreme Economic Council of the Republic"]

[Text] *The Supreme Economic Council of the republic has been established pursuant to the decisions of the First Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies. Our correspondent Yu. Yakutin discussed the tasks of the council with R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.*

[Yakutin] Ruslan Imranovich, regulations on the Supreme Economic Council of the republic are still being worked on. However, its main functions may, perhaps, be outlined already. What are they?

[Khasbulatov] This is going to be a consultative, coordinating organ which vigorously facilitates the implementation of the economic reform and a transition to a market economy. Its priority task is to work out programs for implementing market methods in the economy of the Russian Federation. Coordination will embrace the operation of all organs of power and administration, ministry and departmental structures, and local soviets. We count on the Supreme Economic Council becoming an effective instrument for our legislators.

[Yakutin] Who will the council report to?

[Khasbulatov] The council will report to the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which increases its significance and ensures close, timely ties with the operations of the Russian parliament. Working on topical problems, preparing documents, coordinating the operation of managerial elements, and verifying compliance with legislative acts, and not only those of the republic but also those of the entire Union, constitute the principal scope of operations of the council which are very important for the successful work of the republic Supreme Soviet. Given this approach, the substantiation of the decisions made also improves, and the effectiveness of law creation is quickly determined.

It is known that many of the laws adopted have been inactive so far. Why? What is to be done? It is now very important to answer these questions, and the council will help obtaining the answers. It will become an organizational-economic instrument of power for the legislators, which makes it possible to study the practice of implementing the laws passed. The council will provide the necessary information to the legislators, as well as an opportunity to be given consultations and expert reviews; it will offer a good opportunity for reinforcing their activities from the standpoint of science and analysis.

The status of the council is quite high—it is placed above ministries and departments, it may request the information needed, and develop such information itself. Here is one more consideration favoring the need to have such an element in the structures of power. At present, in the course of very serious changes, when extensive reform activities are underway, the council may reveal differing views of the processes underway and facilitate the selection of the most valuable solutions from among those proposed, and the consolidation of positions.

[Yakutin] Will new economic and public entities, such as the associations and unions of lessees and cooperative members, be represented in the council?

[Khasbulatov] Undoubtedly the representatives of these entities will become members of the council. The representatives of the oblast echelon of local soviets, scientists, specialists from agriculture and industry, as well as public organizations, will also be members of the council. It is important to have the adherents of various views and concepts in the council. As we have become convinced, a lopsided approach to solving specific problems is not the best way to do business. It was manifested in the course of working out a Union program for switching to a market economy which has brought about undesirable results as far as the perception of the program is concerned.

[Yakutin] Does this mean that the council makes it possible to discuss proposals comprehensively and determine public opinion at the preparatory stage of working on documents, prior to their discussion in the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies?

[Khasbulatov] Definitely. You would agree that such verification is absolutely necessary at present, now that we have imposed on ourselves very exacting deadlines for preparing the legislative acts and legal documents necessary for a transition to a market economy. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet has allowed 500 days for this; I am already monitoring how much time has passed, how much remains to be done, and how much has been accomplished. Work is already underway; for example, I am working on a package of documents on foreign economic operations.

[Yakutin] Does this also mean economic contacts with other Union republics?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, the documents in question will embrace this sphere of relations as well—all economic contacts reaching beyond the boundaries of Russia.

[Yakutin] How will the council interact with the government and other economic structures? You know the economic history of our country well, and you know that in the initial years of Soviet power the Supreme Council of the National Economy, the VSNKh, operated which ceased to exist at the end of the New Economic Policy. Can we find similarities in its operation and that of the Supreme Economic Council being set up in the republic?

[Khasbulatov] In accomplishing its tasks the Supreme Economic Council is called upon to create a favorable sphere of operations for the government without interfering in its current affairs. After all, the very fact that the government exists dooms it to executing a tremendous amount of urgent, routine operations. Even the most perfect government has little time left for reflection, analysis, and repatterning its own activities, its own self. Given that the organization of the government itself has not been determined yet, and that many transformations still lie ahead for us, the Supreme Economic Council may be an essential instrument of their preparation. The council may substantiate the recommendations of the government itself, and its economic wing in particular. It is meant to speed up the implementation of the new methods of economic operations on the basis of collating practical experience and to ensure the monitoring of the implementation of new laws.

We should take into account the fact that there are new spheres of work as well which by no means fit within the regular framework of government operations. For example, we need to pay special attention to the operation of small enterprises in order to make a transition to the market, create it. As I see it, there should be 1.5 to 2 million of them in the Russian Federation within a year or two; no market will be formed otherwise. We could take the path of creating a special ministry, as in other countries, in order to develop small-scale enterprise. However, what will this ministry do and how will it work if there are still no small enterprises themselves? It seems to me that in this instance it is necessary to use the council and instruct it to prepare decisions which will be implemented through the Supreme Soviet, as procedures call for.

Another example: An absolutely new situation has developed in conjunction with the decision adopted on the delineation of powers of the USSR and the RSFSR. Who should handle the practical determination of the spheres and forms of interaction of the republic and the center? The government itself? This is hardly proper. This means that a sufficiently influential, authoritative, and well-prepared collective should exist which is capable of considering these issues objectively and impartially and proposing solutions.

A completely new situation is also developing in conjunction with the transfer of all foreign economic operations to the jurisdiction of Russia. A tremendous amount of work involving the preparation of up to 30 new normative acts to be submitted to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet needs to be done in this sphere.

As we can see, there are endeavors and functions which by far transcend the framework of operations of the government and the ministries. This is why those who are apprehensive about the Supreme Economic Council infringing on the powers of the government are wrong.

I agree that historical parallels are called for. The VSNKh appeared at a similar historically critical point. At present, a sort of historical niche has developed for the Supreme Economic Council in which it can act until new institutions, including economic, become firmly established in our republic. Apparently, the council will evolve later, and will handle general projections, trends, and scientific research.

[Yakutin] Ruslan Imranovich, at present many regions making a transition to self-financing raise the issue of creating large regional economic structures within the framework of, say, the central economic region or the Urals. Does the council intend to use representatives of regional complexes in its work?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, of course, we should pool our efforts and attract all the best forces of the oblasts, krays, and autonomous entities, including the new regional formations which will unavoidably appear.

However, if we were to respond in brief to a question concerning the most important point, it would be our transition to market relations. The program which the USSR government has proposed does not make it clear to quite a few people what the market is about. There are two very serious and undesirable aspects in the assessment of the market. The first one is that the people have begun to perceive the market as a condition for increasing prices. The second is that the market is being associated with the appearance of tremendous unemployment, 10 to 15 million.

Such views are indicative of a complete failure to understand the market. Let us look at, for example, unemployment. The appearance of 1.5 to 2 million small-scale enterprises will not only make it possible to create a market environment itself in the sphere of production but also to employ the labor which is freed up. However, this is not the only thing that needs to be taken into account. A tremendous number of new employees will be required to create a market infrastructure—information, advertising, credit, and other support units.

At the initial stages of the road to a market economy serious problems will develop with finding the labor needed rather than unemployment. As I see it, unemployment will appear in about five years, after the market is introduced and saturated with consumer staples. At this point the economy will begin intertwining

with the structure of the world market extensively, and under pressure from it major structural changes will occur, as well as the release of workers from the backward production facilities which are not competitive. However, by that time we will have passed the most difficult stage of economic invigoration. The state and the populace will have acquired some savings. It will be possible to prepare for such processes.

The two theses on the unavoidability of enormous price increases and considerable unemployment have scared the populace and created a bias against the market. We should overcome it, change public opinion, and show the significance of a regulated market for improving economic activities and our life. In this instance the council may have a big role to play. It is also essential that the council will be able to improve the substantiation of the decisions made and their quality.

The quality of everything we do in the legislative sphere should be good; we should enact decisions quickly, and meet the deadline set—500 days. If we entrust everything to the government it will be forced, like the Union Government, to proceed extremely slowly, through long discussions and hearings. The RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies resolved to proceed toward a market economy, and we need to create all conditions for this.

Many people, both from industry and academy members, have expressed their desire to take part in the work of the council.

[Yakutin] Will working structures of the soviet be created?

[Khasbulatov] Such structures are necessary; we need departments, analytical groups, sectors. We need specialization and consistency in the operation of the council. There will also be consultative meetings. In general, I am a proponent of inviting experts, specialists from various countries and international organizations.

[Yakutin] You are a major scientist, a well-known essayist; you have frequently criticized bureaucracy on the pages of the press. Our newspaper published a review of your book "Socialism and Bureaucracy." Now you have ended up within a management hierarchy yourself. Do you feel bureaucratic pressure in your work from, for example, the apparatus of the republic Supreme Soviet?

[Khasbulatov] I do, though, perhaps, not in the mundane sense which is meant here. However, first, we lack almost one-half of the staff, and "bureaucrats" are yet to be hired. Selecting cadres for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is a big problem. Of course, the workload is considerable, you have to stay later and come earlier. Strong qualifications are required.

Serious pressure is exerted by the existing power structures. This is sort of a gigantic shadow cast by our power structures. However, an active process of the emergence of people's power is underway, and the forms and methods of work of the management organs are changing. The main point in all of this is democratization, taking into account varied opinions, attitudes, and experience.

[Yakutin] What would you like to tell the readers of our newspaper?

[Khasbulatov] Unexpectedly, I found much support for my work from our industrialists and specialists, the main readers of the newspaper EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN. Letters which come to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet contain many interesting ideas, proposals, and drafts by enterprise managers and specialists working in the national economy. I would like to express my gratitude to all of them and invite them to cooperate and engage in a dialogue.

Any idea you would like to share with us will be given attention; everything valuable will be supported and considered by the Supreme Economic Council. Our republic has many talented people with interesting ideas. They should not remain on the sidelines of the great endeavor of the renaissance of Russia. All of us should contribute to this work, and pull Russia out of the crisis, make sure that better progress is achieved and that Russia becomes a driving force for the renewal of the Union. The processes of integration which are underway throughout the world will be reinforced here, and will overcome centrifugal forces as soon as the economic situation begins improving. These positive changes need to be speeded up.

New Moscow Newspapers, Radio Station Announced

LD2307175190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] The presidium of the Moscow Soviet has made a decision to found two daily newspapers. One is called KURANTY [CHIMES], and the other NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA [INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER]. Their creation has been brought about by the fact that the existing structure of publications covering the life of the capital does not meet the demands of today. New publications are needed, both in terms of their character and in terms of their genre, said Orlov, chairman of the Moscow soviet commission for freedom of speech, mass media, and public organizations' affairs. Neither newspaper is an organ of the Moscow Soviet in the sense which we have come to understand. The Moscow Soviet is acting only as their founder, but interrelations between editorial offices and founder will be determined by the statutes of these publications, as is provided for by the USSR law on the press and other mass media. Apart from the newspapers, a radio station, Ekho Moskvy [Echo of Moscow] is being created. Along with the Moscow Soviet, its founders are the radio association, the journal OGONEK, and the journalism faculty at Moscow State University.

Peat Bog Fires Threaten Gas Pipelines

LD2407105990 Moscow TASS in English 1055 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Prutkin]

[Text] Nadym, Western Siberia, July 24 TASS—Owing to a heat wave, unusual for the area (air temperature has frequently measured above 40 degrees centigrade), fires on peat bogs and the taiga have been raging for more than a week now.

The facilities at the Yamburg gas-condensate field, one of the Soviet Union's largest, are now protected by an earth bank. Fire-protection barriers are being constructed along trunk pipelines which supply natural gas to Soviet and foreign users.

"Twelve thousand hectares of bogs have already been devoured," Nikolay Kovrigin, chairman of the Nadym city executive committee, told TASS.

"Although the fires have shifted, spreading to northeast, the threat to gas pipelines and residential townships continues.

"The wind may change and anything is possible. Fire fighting efforts are complicated by the shortage of specialised equipment. Air-borne fire fighters from other regions, cadets of fire-fighting schools and civil defence personnel have now joined in the work. A 60-kilometer fire strip has been localised," Kovrigin said.

'600 Seconds' Program Temporarily Off Air

PM2307153590 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Jul 90 p 4

[From the "We Answer Readers' Questions" feature: "'600 Seconds' On Vacation"]

[Text] "I found out by chance that next week Leningrad television is not scheduling the '600 Seconds' program. What has happened?" (V. Morozova, Leningrad).

Here is the answer of our colleagues at Leningrad television.

Viewers will not see this popular program next month. But nothing terrible has happened. Nobody has banned "600 Seconds." Aleksandr Nevzorov and his colleagues have simply gone on vacation en bloc, after which the program will take its usual slot on the air.

Leningrad Gas Shortage Linked to Baltics

PM2407094590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent N. Volynskiy under the "Event and Commentary" rubric: "Gasoline Shock"]

[Text] Leningrad—The gasoline situation in Leningrad has somewhat improved recently. The waiting lines at the gas stations have become shorter, the drivers calmer. But just two or three weeks ago....

In general it was a very real shock, the peak of the severest gasoline crisis which Leningrad has ever known. The waiting lines at gas stations were up to 150-200 vehicles long; you had to wait more than 24 hours in them. People's nerves frayed, quarrels flared up and threatened to become fights. And the day came when the pumps in almost all the gas stations were drained to the "empty" mark. This affected mainly "Ai-93" gas for cars, and there are about half a million of them, including state-owned vehicles, in the city.

And then car owners staged a demonstration: They barricaded one of the city's busiest highways—Kirovskiy Prospekt—with cars in order to draw the attention of the local authorities.

The causes of the current gas crisis in Leningrad are several. The short shutdown of equipment for scheduled maintenance work at the Kirishi oil refinery in March is cited as one reason. But it can have had no substantial influence on the situation. The present shortage arose in the middle of May. A rumor swept the city about a possible rise in gasoline prices. One or two private operators in Leningrad began to stock up on it. But all the same Leningrad car drivers could not have quadrupled the level of "Ai-93" gas purchases.

The discovery of quite a substantial shipment of gasoline, and not just "Ai-93" gas, outside the city, to the Baltic region, was another matter.

And then the leaders of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products attempted to set norms for supply and, in particular, to restrict the refueling of cars with Lithuanian license plates. The Leningrad Soviet immediately repealed the State Committee's instruction. And only when the tension had reached its peak did the Leningrad Soviet Presidium introduce norms—40 liters for cars, 80 liters for trucks.

The gasoline situation has somewhat improved.

Leningrad Komsomol Transfers Enterprises

LD2107072190 Moscow TASS in English 0710 GMT 21 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Arkatovskiy]

[Text] Leningrad July 21 TASS—The Leningrad regional committee of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League (Komsomol) decided, after long doubts and hesitations, to begin the transfer of enterprises, earlier belonged to Komsomol, to joint-stock and private ownership.

Regional Committee Economic Director Oleg Kontonistov told TASS that democratisation in the Komsomol was proceeding faster than in the Soviet Communist Party.

"While they in the party Central Committee think what to do with the party property, we decided, without waiting for the initiative from below, to transfer our enterprises to collective and private ownership. There are about 200 such enterprises in Leningrad with an annual turnover of over R100 million," Kontonistov said.

"We were prompted to take this step by the emerging market in the USSR, in conditions of which youth enterprises will need total independence from the Komsomol apparatus in order to survive," Kontonistov said.

"However, we are far from indifferent to how and for whom Komsomol enterprises will work in new conditions. We want the greater part of profits to go to young Leningraders' needs. Therefore, this point is specially stipulated in agreements, which the Komsomol regional committee signs with enterprises. The absolute majority of Leningrad youth enterprises' directors expressed their desire 'to party ways' with the Komsomol."

Sverdlovsk Soviet Chairman Voted Out

90UN2424A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 29, 21 Jul 90 p 2

[Article by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent V. Fomin, Sverdlovsk: "Passions Surrounding Power: One More Has Been 'Bobyknuled' [Voted Out]"]

[Text] One more political leader—Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies Chairman V. Vlasov—has recently been 'bobyknuled' [voted out]. Of the 217 deputies who participated in the session's work, 146 voted for early termination of his authority in this post.

The neologism "bobyknutsya" is the personal contribution of Sverdlovsk residents to the creative language process of our time. The last name of the former Sverdlovsk CPSU Obkom [oblast committee] First Secretary (naturally, against the owner's will), who became famous for his infamous note to the 19th All-Union Party Conference Presidium, provided the root of the new word.

A. Bobykin paid for it with his prestige and in the end with his position as first secretary also including with [his name] in time. The same fate has also overtaken V. Vlasov now. The latter, being an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] [people's] deputy, was careless enough to speak out against the possible candidacy of B. Yeltsin to the post of RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman during a meeting of representatives of deputy groups at the CPSU Central Committee.

Hundreds of letters, telegrams, demands, and resolutions with expressions of no confidence in the oblast soviet chairman have been sent to the soviet. We already know how the oblast session reacted to this.

Quite a few questions remain unanswered despite the complete transmission of this episode in the session's work on oblast television and the apparently complete clarity of assessments. For example, is the deed commensurate with the subsequent reaction? Today, are charges of an unethical [standard] of speech and divergence of one's personal position with the majority position sufficient for dismissal? Did we need to renew the Soviets and struggle for the transfer of total power to them in order for this power to immediately adopt the worst methods of removing command bureaucratic system people from the political arena? Would it not really be better to present the opportunity to decide a deputy's fate to his immediate constituents? There is a mechanism for early review in the law.

Finally, given Ural residents' understandable and legitimate desire to protect B. Yeltsin's prestige, does this sensational act not provide the Russian Supreme Soviet chairman with a well-meaning gesture that has backfired? As far as I can judge, Boris Nikolayevich himself, having experienced the delights of living in the "skin of an opposition member," is not at all an advocate of removing his own opposition and his own critics using methods proposed to him from Sverdlovsk. Then others could quickly jump at the extended solution.

It is possible that these lines of reflection may suddenly appear to be erroneous, unethical, or not reflecting the majority opinion to someone. It would be terrible if [I am] once again for the majority.

Democratic Party of Russia Created in Kazov

LD2307213590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2022 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Video report by television correspondent I. Latypov from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] And now a report from Kazan where the Democratic Party of Russia [Demokraticheskaya Partiya Rossii], one of whose leaders is Nikolay Travkin, has been created. Here is I. Latypov:

[Latypov] Despite the summer day of rest and the students' holidays—the conference was held at Kazan University—the hall, which holds a thousand people, was packed. Undoubtedly, among those present were not only suporters of Travkin, but also those critical of his party's program. However, it may be claimed that after this meeting the number of opponents has been considerably reduced. Travkin's speech was received with sympathy and applause. He spoke about the program of the Democratic Party of Russia [DRP] and its main tasks—the establishment of true sovereignty for Russia, and the establishment of power of the soviets at all levels. The Tatar republican branch of the DRP and its leader, Valeriy Kurnosov, secretary of the Leninskiy Raykom of the Kazan Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], were unanimously elected.

A reception into the new party, whose ranks were today swelled by several hundreds inhabitants of Kazan, was held at the conference.

A crowded meeting was then held in the city center in support of the conference. [video: scenes from the conference with some of the speakers and shot of outdoor meeting in city center]

Government Wants Compensation for Rostov Plant

LD2207000990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2200 GMT on 21 July carries a report by an unidentified correspondent from the Rostov nuclear electric power station, which local deputies have decided to close down due to popular demand. However, the Ministry of Atomic Power engineering is now demanding that they pay compensation for the more than one billion rubles that have been spent on it. An unidentified official points out that this ruling goes against the law on self administration, for which there is no mechanism to put into action.

Rostov Oblast's Food Supply Problems Viewed

PM2007141590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Vladimir But with commentary by I. Demchenko, under "Direct Line" rubric: "Retaliatory Measure"]

[Text] Rostov—The Rostov Oblast Agro-industrial Union has virtually ceased dispatching vegetables to Moscow and Leningrad in reply to measures taken by them to flood their own market with goods on a priority basis.

Not so long ago the oblast supplied less meat to the Union-republic stocks than the plan stipulated. After that followed tangible sanctions: In retaliation lots of goods of all kinds were not received there. But the agricultural workers tried to make up the shortfall in spite of everything, even in spite of the sharply worsening scarcity of goods.

Current relations with Moscow and Leningrad have taken on a different tone. In the last six months "Moskvich" cars, refrigerators, and many other goods produced in those cities have not been received by the oblast. It is known here that the capital and the city on the Neva have taken steps to flood their own market with goods on a priority basis.

Rostov vegetable growers retaliated in the following way: Of the 25,000 tonnes of vegetables they were supposed to dispatch to Moscow, they sent only 1,000. Only 60 tonnes of the "stipulated" 8,000 tonnes were dispatched to Leningrad. There's a retaliatory measure for you...

At the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] they commented: We should have hauled them over the coals earlier for not delivering. But sometime it is necessary to switch to market relations. [But ends].

Our Commentary

Neither the Moscow City Soviet nor Moscow Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee] have passed decisions in recent months on curtailing stocks deliveries of consumer goods to other oblasts and republics. I was given such information at the Moscow City Ispolkom secretariat.

V. Kozlov, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] deputy minister of trade confirmed: The Rostov people's accusations are groundless. This, for example, is the situation regarding "Moskviches." Last year Russia, including Moscow and Leningrad, received 40,000 fewer market stocks of cars. They simply were not made. This year a daily average of 350 vehicles instead of the stipulated 400 are rolling off the production line of Moscow's Lenin Komsomol Motor Vehicle Plant. But nevertheless in the first half-year 177 "Moskviches" were delivered to Rostov Oblast instead of the 136 stipulated by the stocks. The situation is similar for other groups of goods. Muscovites are trying to fulfill all commodity deliveries despite the serious goods famine in the city. And if breakdowns occur, then they are to do with general production holdups, and not with malicious intent.

In addition the minister noted the growing tendency of the development of regional egoism. Many oblast trade organizations, including some in Rostov, bluntly declare their intention to keep the principal part of output produced for themselves, while demanding that the rest supply them with goods in previous, or else in larger, volumes.

Our correspondent was correctly told at Rostov Oblispolkom: It is necessary to change to market relations. But the market presupposes mutual respect by trading parties and their mutual responsibilities to each other. If the Rostov people have questions for the Moscow City Soviet or Moscow Gorispolkom, it is obvious that they must be clarified in the normal manner, and not in the language of ultimatums. Otherwise we will get not a market, but appanage principalities with a barter economy.

Kemerovo Signs Deal With Italian Food Firm

PM2307155590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 19 Jul 90

[Report by N. Chirkov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Even with appeals from the mass media, the shortages are not lessening. An ispolkom [soviet executive committee] in the Kuzbass has adopted the willful decision to fill food stores with the help of the Italian firm "Fata." A contract has been signed straight off. Anyone who doesn't take risks doesn't stand to gain. I think that both sides have said this about themselves.

[Chirkov] There is no problem buying a load of fresh vegetables during the summer at Kemerovo's markets. Though short, the Siberian summer is generous in its

harvest. There is a considerable amount of produce here, particularly early vegetables and fruit. Siberians bring them in from southern parts of the country. In order to extend the pleasure many people lay in stores for the winter, put things by for storage and pickling, and make aromatic preserves. In short they act with foresight. After all, in winter, particularly toward spring, vegetables become scarce in the stores. It is hard to reproach the Kemerovo trading outlets. Thanks to intensive construction of winter storage facilities they can store 60,000 tonnes of vegetables and potatoes. But it is still not possible to preserve everything. Every year 10,000-12,000 tonnes are lost. And there are virtually no processing workshops in Kemerovo. Processing technology is not perfect—and not only for vegetables, but also for milk, meat, and fish. The contract with the Italian firm "Fata" signed in Kemerovo is the beginning of long-term cooperation in this field. The aim is to improve the food situation in the Kuzbass. "Fata" enjoys firm prestige in the world. It has enterprises in our country, for instance the well known agrofirm "Kuban." In short, before signing the contract—and the tentative value of just a short-term two-year program is $650,000—Kemerovo's specialists visited the firm's enterprise and acquainted themselves with its output. Recommendations from the USSR Government were also taken into consideration here. The program covers the process from the field to the store. It is made up of separate chapters dealing with processing, packaging, parceling, storage, transportation, and, lastly, the sale of food products in the stores. As we can see, it is not only various workshops that are to be constructed, but also cold storage facilities, storehouses, and trading enterprises. Where is it best to site them, in the city or near production sites, with a view to optimizing the program? The Italians visited a number of the Kuzbass' processing enterprises, sovkhozes [state farms], and kolkhozes [collective farms]. Finding the most rational sites for the enterprises to be constructed is a necessary phase of the work.

Cholera Outbreak Reported in Stavropol

LD2407204390 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Styazhkin]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—Cases of cholera have been reported, affecting people who stayed at a Rodnik camping in Stavropol territory in the south of Russia. Thirteen people have been hospitalised.

The disease was caused by the use of polluted water from a spring well, containing cholera pathogenes, said Russian Federation Deputy Health Minister Yevgeniy Belyayev who arrived in Stavropol to investigate.

TASS correspondent Zinayda Khrmova asked First Deputy Health Minister of the Russian Federation Viktor Panov to comment on the facts. Panov said that the Russian Federation Health Ministry dispatched a group of medical workers, including the Ministry's chief infectionist, to Stavropol to help eliminate the source of the disease and assist local physicians in taking sanitary, hygienic and other measures to prevent an outbreak of epidemics.

Not only sick people but all those who contacted them or drank water from the same source, infected by waste discharges, were hospitalised. Those who reacted negatively to lab tests for cholera pathogenes were then released. They will remain under medical observation for some time at places of their residence.

Eighty-two people are now staying at the camping site. Although all of them are feeling well, urgent preventive measures are being applied at the insistence of experts.

Bathing and swimming in local water reservoirs and taking water from them for drinking have been prohibited.

The set of measures being currently applied give rise to the hope that the local source of sickness will soon be fully eliminated.

Unauthorized Meeting Demands Kumyk Sovereignty

LD2107192190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] An unauthorized meeting took place in Makhachkala today. Those taking part were demanding that the sovereign rights of a national territorial formation be granted to the Kumyks. This demand has been put forward by the (Tengli) public committee—tranlsated from the Kumyk language, this means "equality." More than 2,000 people from the rural areas located on the Caspian littorial plain gathered in the Dagestan capital. Regarding this part of the autonomous republic to be their ancestral lands, the Kumyks oppose the migration process.

It is hard at present to evaluate these and other demands of those at the meeting, but we shall point out that similar problems of social, cultural, and ethnic development are raised by the representatives of other ethnic groups, too. Many issues written on slogans and shouted by those at the meeting have already been resolved in recent years. A commission of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Dagestan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and of the oblast CPSU committee, which was specially set up, has worked on these. Other issues are being reviewed in accordance with the law, and taking into account the interests of every ethnic group living in the autonomous republic.

Industrial Accident Affects Bryansk Water Supply

LD2307191790 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT 23 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Lodkin]

[Text] Bryansk July 23 TASS—All the water intake facilities supplying water to the city of Bryansk have had

to be cut off because of the pollution of the water in the Desna River with phenol and other toxic substances.

The city with a population of 500,000 will be supplied with water from reserve artesian wells and these supplies will have to be rationed.

The situation is likely to remain unchanged for at least a week—the time required for the self-purification of the river around the city.

The pollution was caused by an accident at the Ivotskiy glass-making factory—two metal reservoirs containing liquid phenol-formaldehyde resins were punctured and leaked nearly 40 tonnes of chemicals, of which part was washed by a shower into the Ivotok Rivulet.

Two hours after the accident the concentration of formaldehyde in the water exceeded the maximum permissible level 400 times, and of phenol—more than 2,200 times.

The situation was considered by the regional commission for emergencies and at the urgently convened meeting of the regional executive committee.

Criminal proceedings were instituted relating to the accident that caused dramatic ecological damage.

Terminal Under Construction at Sochi Airport

PM2407090990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Jul 90

[Report by A. Melkonyan from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The most stressful period for our transport workers has now arrived. The time when thousands, millions of people set off on vacation. As in previous years, unfortunately, neither Aeroflot nor the Ministry of Railways can cope with the flood of passengers who, during these months, set off to spa resorts, to the seaside. The reasons are all the same. Namely the lack of railroad cars and the requisite numbers of aircraft, holdups with fuel, and airport terminals that are unable to admit and dispatch passengers. As you watch this report from Sochi, I would remind you that last year Aeroflot was forced to refuse to carry 15 million passengers. Imagine the material losses, not to mention the interminable lines, the waiting, the nervous strain, and the losses incurred by the state and us.

[Melkonyan] More than 4 million passengers fly into Sochi—our best resort—annually, 3 million of them during the summer months. Nowadays there are all kinds of aircraft on the landing strip, including the wide-bodied airbus. The terminal was built in 1950 and can only take up to 600 passengers an hour. Imagine what happens here when two Il-86's, say, arrive at short intervals, each carrying 350 passengers. [video shows crowded airport terminal] What kind of level of service and attention to the passengers can there be in such overcrowded lounges in the absence of any automation whatsoever? Conditions for airport employees are worse, not better, which makes it difficult to work steadily. Talks have been under way for decades regarding the need for a new terminal, and now, finally, in cooperation with a Yugoslav firm construction has begun. There's a tight schedule. [video shows new terminal construction site] At the end of 1992 the new terminal should already be taking roughly 3,000 passengers an hour. [video shows model of new terminal] Some 2,500 of them on internal flights, 500 on international flights. The planners say that electronic equipment will make it possible to control all processes—from the landing of aircraft in highly complex meteorological conditions to the rapid provision of services for passengers, who will be served by all kinds of communications systems, transport, restaurants, and bars. One can but hope and trust that this is the case, so to speak, although....

Is it not the case that while this terminal is under construction, the design will become outmoded, as happened, say, with Sheremetyevo-2?

[V.N. Stepanov, deputy chief of the Civil Aviation Northern Caucasus Directorate] No, this design is very contemporary, it reflects all the highest technologies.

[V.N. Repnikov, airport chief] It is primarily a new service for the passengers, both Soviet and foreign passengers, but it is also our personnel's normal workplace. There is also a paradox, namely the terminal complex does not provide unadulterated income and profit. It is necessary for companies to fly direct to Sochi airport. We are trying to resolve this question ourselves directly with the Ministry of Civil Aviation.

[Melkonyan] That is, you are talking about developing direct ties?

[Repnikov] Naturally, it is in the common interest of both Aeroflot and our country.

[Newscaster] So there is to be a new airport. But in the new economic conditions it is, after all, not only important to construct the terminal in a timely fashion, especially since Sochi wants to stage the Winter Olympics in 1998, but also to make correct use of it. For that reason today the people of Sochi, together with Aeroflot, must consider the prospects for new direct flights, both between our country's cities and abroad. This will make it possible to cover the outlay more rapidly.

Western Republics

Belorussian Draft Sovereignty Declaration Examined

LD2407174290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] At today's session of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia the document that was, in the assessment of the deputies, the most important—the draft declaration of state sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—was submitted. Three variants were presented for consideration by the parliamentarians.

The authors of the first one were on a commission specially set up by the Supreme Soviet to draw up the draft declaration. The deputies' group of the Belorussian Popular Front expressed its conception of state independence. The third document was presented by 21 deputies. The right to present the versions of each group went to Dementey, chairman of the Supreme Soviet; (Poznyak), head of the Belorussian Popular Front; and People's Deputy (Gushkeyevich).

It has been explained that the draft of the Belorussian Popular Front essentially presupposes Belorussia's secession from membership in the USSR. The third variant contains a milder formulation and, in the opinion of Yevgeniy Gushkeyevich, may be supported by a larger number of people's deputies.

It was decided to put forward amendments and additions to the draft declaration on state sovereignty which was adopted. Following this a heated discussion developed. Diametrically opposed points of view were expressed. Representatives of a veterans' organization and radical deputies explained their views of the problem. The center appealed for consolidation. The main controversy developed around the issue of which powers were to be placed within Union competence, whether to remain within the membership of the USSR in general, and how independent the republic is from an economic point of view.

In the short time available the deputies did not come to any kind of agreement. The main discussion on the declaration of state sovereignty is therefore still to come.

New Belorussian Foreign Minister Appointed

LD2407115790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Forty-year-old historian Petr Kravchenko has been appointed minister of foreign affairs of Belorussia by decision of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Belorussia Hopes To Fund Chernobyl Compensation

PM2407154790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent M. Shimanskiy report: "Decision Adopted; No Money"]

[Text] Minsk—A session of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has decided that, effective 1 August this year, a further 1.8 million inhabitants of the republic's rayons subjected to radioactive contamination as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station will receive an additional payment.

It is a question of compensation for the population living in rayons with contamination at one-to-five curies per square kilometer and of the sources for funding it. A proposal was submitted to pay every inhabitant of such rayons R15 a month. Such compensation must embrace approximately 1.8 million people. This will cost R324 million a year.

Where are such funds to be found? After long and agonizing debate the deputies proposed the following: to make use of the financial resources of enterprises in the republic which at present lie like a dead weight because there is nothing to buy with them. The second way is to seek this sum in the republic's budget. But the Belorussian SSR budget deficit for 1991 stands at approximately R500 million.

In short, the republic Supreme Soviet has not yet found a source to fund such an essential cause. Nevertheless, 262 out of 265 deputies voted for such compensation.

The increases will be added on as of 1 August. The deputies proposed that the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers find the funds for this additional payment.

New Moldavian Party Bureau Holds First Meeting

90UN2227C Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 pp 1, 3

[Unattributed article: "In the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] The first working meeting of the new staff of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau took place. It examined urgent measures to publicize and explain the materials of the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress as well as arrangements to implement critical notes and proposals put forward by delegates to the congress and to city and rayon party conferences.

It was noted in a decree, adopted on the occasion of this issue, that the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress was a great event in the public life of the republic. It showed the ability of the republic party organization to draw lessons from the past, interpret the present, and rally communists and all the elements of society in the interests of resolving the tasks of perestroyka. The departments of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the party gorkoms [city party committees] and raykoms [rayon party committees] were charged with implementing concrete measures to implement the numerous critical notes and proposals of the delegates. The majority of these notes and proposals were candid and pressing in nature and demonstrated concern for the welfare of the people and for the fate of the party and socialism, and they were directed at helping the republic's party organization catch up to the processes occurring in society, affirming its independence, strengthening the ideological and organizational unity of party ranks, and fundamentally increasing the activities of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, its Bureau, and the apparat.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau decided to introduce into the Moldavian SSR

[Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet as a legislative initiative a proposal decreeing 31 August—the day the Moldavian SSR Law on the State Language was adopted—the holiday "Limba Noastre" ("Our Language"). There was confidence that the holiday "Limba Noastre" ("Our Language") will become a significant event in the spiritual life of the republic and will turn out to be a positive influence on the restoration of Moldavian culture and the improvement of interethnic relations on the road to full civil harmony. An organizational committee for the preparation and conduct of the holiday was approved.

The meeting of the Central Committee Bureau examined the question of a political evaluation of the tragic consequences of the 1946-1947 famine in the Moldavian SSR.

In the course of discussion it was noted that, thanks to the democratization and glasnost which were evoked by revolutionary perestroyka, the ban has been removed from public education on many poorly investigated historical events, including the severe drought and subsequent terrible famine of 1946-1947 that led to massive loss of human life. The decree, which will be published in the press, acknowledges that the famine of 1946-1947 was a genuine tragedy for the Moldavian people and was a consequence of, along with the drought, the command and administrative system of Stalin and the policy of the Central Committee Bureau of the All-Union Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) with regard to the peasantry. Its policy and the party and state leadership of Moldavia were condemned.

Taking into account the fundamental changes occurring in modern public life and the renewal of the party, which foreordain new approaches to ideological-theoretical and psychological-pedagogical preparation of the party and ideological aktiv and to a increase in the political culture of communists, the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has decided to transform the Palace of Political Education of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee into the Center for Political Culture of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, having abolished courses increasing the qualification of party, soviet, and ideological cadres and the University of Marxism-Leninism of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee. With regard to this question the decree stipulates the transformation of offices of political education of the city and rayon party committees into branches of the Center for Political Culture.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau studied the question of a new structure for the apparat of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee. With the goal of perfecting it, the organizational-party and cadre work, ideological, ethnic relations, state and legal, agricultural, socioeconomic, and general departments were abolished. All work on the design and implementation of party policy is concentrated in the organizational, ideological, socioeconomic, and agricultural commissions created by the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. Problem groups for the most important work trends will be formed in each of these commissions, and they will enlist, in addition to released party workers, members of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, scholars, and specialists. This will permit the development of a new model for interrelations between the apparat and members of electoral party organs.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau also examined several other questions of party life.

Amendments to Moldavian Constitution Published

90UN2227A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 p 1

[Law of the SSR of Moldova under the rubric "Official": "On the Introduction of Amendments to the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Moldavian SSR"]

[Text] The SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova decrees:

1. To introduce into the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Moldavian SSR the following amendments:

In the title, preamble, and throughout the whole text of the Law, to replace the words "Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic" with the words "Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova"; the words "Moldavian SSR" with the words "SSR of Moldova"; the words "Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers" and "Moldavian SSR government" with the words "SSR of Moldova government"; the words "chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers" with the words "prime minister of the SSR of Moldova."

2. The law goes into effect the moment it is adopted.
[Signed] M. Snegur, chairman of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet.
[Dated] Kishinev, 5 June 1990.

Kiev Public Transport Workers Stage Strike

LD2407113190 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 24 Jul 90

[by TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev July 24 TASS—Hundreds of thousands of Kiev residents reported late for work today, as the Ukrainian capital's tram and trolley-bus depots went on strike for higher pay and social benefits.

Their demands include increases in drivers' pay ratios and bonuses for regular service, compensation for work during and after the Chernobyl clean-up effort, lower pension ages for women after 20 years on their job and men after 25 years, more housing allotments, and better spare time supplies.

"We made the same demands during a warning strike on July 6, which lasted three and a half hours," Driver Natalya Podgala, a strike committee member, told TASS.

"While the intensity and nervous strain of our work resembles that of miners, our pay is much lower. The technical standards of vehicles are utterly unsatisfactory: Every fourth tram and trolley-bus is past its service life and should be written off, and there are no spare parts.

"Our depots are understaffed, and we frequently have to do overtime. But taking a rest after work, that is often problematic: 1,100 transport workers in the city are on the waiting list for housing," Podgala said.

She said that following the warning strike, the city council took completely unsatisfactory stop-gap measures, while transport workers want a specific timetable for meeting their demands.

Podgala said that they will resume work only after they are given such a schedule.

According to the latest reports, some bus depots have decided to join the strike as well.

Workers' Demands Met; Strike Ends

LD2407202690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [video shows idle transport] We have just received a report from our correspondents from Kiev: The city soviet of peoples' deputies has made the decision to generally satisfy all the demands of the workers of the streetcar and trolley directorate, and also to sum up other demands and present them for examination by the city executive committee by 15 August this year. By the evening the city's electric transport resumed work.

Reportage on Hoisting Ukraine Nationalist Flag

Raising Flag Considered 'Illegal'

LD2407192890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] The blue and yellow flag was raised today on the flagstaff in front of the building of the Kiev city executive committee, after a blessing in St. Sofia Cathedral. After a decision by deputies of the city soviet of the capital of the Ukraine, it has taken its place next to the state red and blue flag of the republic.

At a meeting that took place in front of the building of the city executive committee, anti-communist slogans were heard, as well as calls for the Ukraine to separate from the USSR.

The decision of the Kiev city soviet goes against the existing Constitution of the Ukraine and other legislative acts. This was stated to a UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent by Senyukov, first deputy prosecutor in the republic. The use of flags and pendants that have not been registered in the prescribed way is not permitted, he stressed. This concerns blue and yellow flags, too. They are not recognized as state symbols by established law, and consequently actions connected with their use—hanging them over buildings—are illegal.

National Flag Ceremony Held

LD2507082490 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Today the Ukrainian national yellow and blue flag was raised over the Kiev City Soviet of People's Deputies. The question of raising the flag had been discussed at the presidium of the Kiev soviet, and the document in favour of this decision was approved as a whole last week. But today, when the presidium was to give its final approval, there was no quorum, because members of the presidium, communists, did not come to the sitting. The thing is that on the eve of the sitting, the bureau of the Kiev city committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine came out against the decision taken by the presidium of the city soviet. This is why today members of the presidium endorsed the decision in a protocol.

In the evening, representatives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous and the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church festively sanctified the flag, and then a multi-thousand column moved to the Kiev city soviet of people's deputies, where the yellow and blue flag was raised. Speaking at the ceremony were people's deputies of the USSR, the Ukraine and the local soviet, all representing the democratic forces of the Ukraine. The ceremony of raising the flag was followed by the national anthem "Ukraine Is Still Alive."

Chernovtsy Decision Disputed

LD2407100390 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] A session of the Chernovtsy City Soviet has adopted a decision that permits inhabitants and public organizations to display freely on the territory of the city the Ukrainian national symbols and those of other peoples whose representatives reside in Chernovtsy. The decision envisages the use of blue and yellow flags, the Trident, and the singing and playing the anthem: "Ukraine Has Not Yet Perished."

However, the oblast procurator's office considers this decision was made by the city council in excess of its prerogatives. Referring to the appropriate articles of the Ukrainian Constitution, the procurator lodged a representation with the oblast soviet demanding that it do away with this violation of the existing legislation governing the use of state symbols.

Kravchuk Addresses Ukraine Supreme Soviet

LD2407122290 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] [Announcer] Leonid Kravchuk, Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] people's deputy and second secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee, was today elected chairman of the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet. After the results of the vote became known, he addressed the session.

[Begin Kravchuk recording] I would like to say that it will be precisely here, in this hall, that on the basis of the great principles of democracy, Soviet rule, and socialist choice we will have to make strides along these principles. If some try to seek another road, it will be a road that may lead people to a new (?misfortune).

I would like to say that only upon this basis, on the basis of the declaration adopted by our Supreme Soviet, on the basis of months-long discussions and dialogues and even bitter misunderstandings that have taken place in this hall, we will be able to implement what we plan and what we have so far failed to do. In the end we must tell our people that the time of confrontation has passed and a period of constructive work has begun, a period of calm and balanced dialogue, because we, all of us in this hall, need each other. We need each other even though we are different. But if we add to this political, parliamentary culture and our lofty responsibility before the people which has entrusted to us a great task, then we shall find the solution or the ways of solving all questions.

I would like to state with all strength that I see my task, the most important part of it, precisely in the Supreme Soviet. We must live in peace and in goodness. We must solve all issues one after another. [end recording]

[Announcer] The opposition did not take part in the election. A statement on its behalf was made by Dmytro Pavlychko, who emphasized that the attempts of the Democratic Bloc to meet all political currents in the parliament halfway did not gain the necessary understanding, and the party interests, as the first round of voting has testified, prevailed over the interests of the people. As a result, members of the Narodna Rada opposition did not vote in the second round. At the same time, the Narodna Rada stated that it remains in opposition and absolves itself of all responsibility for actions of the newly elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Adopts AES Appeal

PM2407102190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 90 Second Edition p 8

[Unidentified correspondent report: "Show Sense"]

[Text] Kiev, 19 Jul—The Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has adopted an appeal to citizens living near nuclear power stations. It says, in particular:

The Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet fully shares the concern over the complex situation that has developed around nuclear power stations and the resulting problems.

The Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet considers the solution of these problems in the Ukraine to be paramount. The agenda of the current session includes the question of a moratorium on the construction of new nuclear power stations and reactor units on Ukrainian territory.

However, an extremely tense situation is now developing in a number of regions where nuclear power stations are situated. Particularly at the Khmelnitskaya Nuclear Power Station, where a second wave of pickets, rallies, and petitions against the construction of nuclear power stations is in progress. All this is having a negative impact on the morale and psychological state of station workers and on their fulfillment of their professional responsibilities and is creating a threat to the work of nuclear power stations.

In this connection the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet urges everyone living near nuclear power stations and other citizens to show sense and restraint and not to take actions that could have unpredictable consequences.

Pickets Block Khmelnitskaya AES

PM2407103790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by L. Ilchenko and cameraman N. Strigun, identified by caption]

[Text] [Newscaster] For several days now pickets organized by Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] and "Green Peace" have been blockading the Khmelnitskaya AES [nuclear electric power station].

[Ilchenko] [video shows tents and pickets outside AES fence] The pickets' encampment has come right up to the protective fencing around the construction site for the Khmelnitskaya AES' second, third, and fourth power units. This is the second week now that hundreds of residents from nearby villages and settlements in Khmelnitskiy and Rovno Oblasts have been living here, demonstrating and pressing for their demands to be met. After all, the zone affected by the consequences of the work at the Khmelnitskaya AES is on the territory of these regions, as we succeeded in finding out, and the reason why emotions are running high here at the foot of the nuclear reactors is the fact that a moratorium has not yet been adopted on the expansion of AES construction elaborated four months ago by the local oblast soviet. Most of the people involved in this siege around the station, as it were, have devoted their vacation time to fighting for an immediate end to the feeding of nuclear fuel into the station's second reactor.

The situation is developing in such a way that the blockade has jeopardized the safe operation of the nuclear facility. Comrade Likin, the station's chief engineer, told journalists this. The administration is trying to

explain things to the demonstrators by means of talks and to discuss the true state of affairs, but nevertheless exhortations are just exhortations, and people are not without reason worried by the continuation of the construction of the station. They have learned that there are considerable shortcomings inherent in the AES' design and allegedly the AES workers themselves are complaining about the poor quality of the equipment manufactured by Soviet industry. In the last three years alone 35 shutdowns and several fires have been recorded in the work of the Khmelnitskaya AES first power unit. Thus there are grounds for people to be alarmed. We were told by the pickets' coordinating council that the blockade of the station will continue until the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet resolves the question of a moratorium.

[Announcer] Those are the pickets' demands. The number of unscheduled shutdowns for various reasons is one of the main indicators of AES reliability. Over the last three years the number of such shutdowns has halved in our country, but that is not enough. Here is an example for comparison. Only 12 percent of all our electricity is produced by nuclear power stations. In Japan and the FRG this figure is 30 percent, while in Sweden and France the figure is 45 and 73 percent respectively.

New Agricultural Trade Union Formed in Ukraine

LD2407210790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] A new trade union has been formed in the Ukraine. Our correspondent Vladimir Sokolov reports.

[Sokolov] One cannot say, of course, that this trade union is entirely new. A trade union of workers of the agro-industrial complex existed in the Ukraine before. But in the course of the recent report-back and election campaign in many primary organizations of this union, increasingly sharp criticism was addressed to its leadership regarding its entire activity. It was said that the trade union had lost its effectiveness with the growth of the state, economic, and party apparatus. Showing up here, evidently, was the quickly changing situation, the change-over to a variety of forms of ownership, to the multi-party system, the course toward the market economy. All this is naturally raising people's demands for social protection.

Under pressure from primary organizations, the congress of the Ukrainian agro-industrial complex trade union, which took place the other day, resolutely revised the fundamentals of its activity. It was decided fairly unanimously to break with the past and to set up a fundamentally new trade union, a separate trade union, independent of any political and social organizations and state bodies. New rules and a program were adopted accordingly. They proclaimed the trade union a mass organization, financially independent and having as its aim the defense of the lawful rights and interests of its members in the new conditions.

The congress instructed its central committee to tackle all questions of trade union services for labor collectives of the republic's agro-industrial complex, to form the structures of the trade union, to create its new bodies, and to determine the staff and the wage fund. In doing so, the independence and priority of the primary organizations in resolving practical questions of current work is provided for. It has been proclaimed that the trade union of the Ukraine's agro-industrial complex will resist government attempts to pull the economy out of the crisis through lowering the working people's living standard, and to decisively stand up for social justice, especially in the transition to market relations.

Inasmuch as rural inhabitants are for all intents and purposes not feeling a real improvement in social insurance and security, the trade union is setting up its own pension fund which it is handing over to the state, and its own social insurance fund which it controls.

Because the legal protection of collective farmers is in many respects limited by the framework of the Collective Farm Rules, the trade union will try to get these rules revised to give collective farm trade union organizations the same rights as at any state enterprise.

In the Ukraine, working conditions in agriculture and industrial hygiene are unsatisfactory in many respects, resulting in an increased occupational illness and accidents. The death rate in the countryside is on average 1.5 times higher than that in the republic's towns. In connection with this, the trade union will protest against the manufacture of agricultural machines which do not comply with the industrial hygiene norms and rules, compensation in full and in one lump sum of losses in connection with production injuries at the expense of enterprises, and make more stringent demands regarding industrial hygiene. Understandably, considerable space in the trade union's activities is being devoted to the entire range of measures to protect rural inhabitants against the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident. Problems of the family, of consumer services, and of the intellectual development of the trade union's members have not been forgotten either.

Special provisos have been made for the social protection of trade union leaders who resolutely stand up for the interests of the trade union members and for this reason frequently are not to the liking both of the administration, and indeed, also of some local bodies. It has been laid down that the trade union will try to ensure that its elected officials for five years after their official capacity has come to an end cannot be dismissed or transferred to another job on the initiative of the administration.

Briefly, the program aims to raise the trade union's all-around effectiveness at turning it toward the most topical, practical matters.

This is already a truly new trade union and, let's add, a major one in the Ukraine. It unites 7.5 million field and farm workers, workers in the processing industry, rural

builders, land improvement workers, and students at agricultural institutions of higher learning, whose interests it is guarding in a new way.

Caucasus

Armenian Supreme Soviet Resumes Work

LD2407202890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] After a two-day break, the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] of the new convocation resumed today in Yerevan. The deputies returned to discussing the formation of the agenda and endorsement of the provisional standing orders. In the course of the discussion, a sharp debate developed. Accordingly, the nomination of candidates for the post of chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, scheduled for today, did not take place.

The session is continuing its work.

Armenia Issues Bonds for Future Purchases

NC2407174590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1850 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] In accordance with a decision of the republic's Council of Ministers, interest-free special purpose government bonds are being sold to the population. In 1993 the owners of the bonds will be able to obtain goods such as refrigerators, washing and sewing machines, videos, color television sets, personal computers, [word indistinct], motorcycles with side-cars, and other goods that are in great demand.

This experiment is being successfully implemented in Edzhmiatsinskiy Rayon. Initially, at the decision of the rayon soviet executive committee, the bonds were allocated only to the labor collectives of rayon organizations and enterprises for distribution to their members. Lately, the rayon soviet executive committee also started to allocate the bonds to any interested organization.

(?The demand) for them is increasing daily. At present, bonds for goods valued at around R700,000 have been distributed. The rayon educational and cultural departments, the administration board of the Elektronshin firm, the production administration of the consumer goods services, the poultry collective of Dzhrarat and other organizations were actively involved in this enterprise.

Armenian Parties Discuss National Congress

NC2407172990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1850 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] The press has reported that the plenipotentiary representatives of the three Armenian national parties were invited to Armenia to discuss matters relating to the convening of a pan-Armenian congress.

Consultations took place in Yerevan from 18 to 23 July between the Sotsyal Demokratakan Hnchakyan [Social Democratic Party, SDH], Hay Hegapokhakan Dashnaktsutyun [Armenian Revolutionary Federation, HHD], and Ramkavar Azatakan [Democratic Liberal Party, RAK] and Armenian Communist parties, with a number of political and social organizations in Armenia participating.

The plenipotentiary representatives of the parties taking part in the consultations defended the idea of convening a pan-Armenian congress and decided to continue to work for one.

Editor Views Satellite News From Armenia

NC2307121890

[Editorial Report] At 1800 GMT on 22 July on its "Crane Youth Program" ("Crane" alluding to the mythical Armenian news-gathering bird) Yerevan International Service in Armenian airs an interview with Akop Avetikyan, the editor of the ZARTONK newspaper of the Ramkavar Azatakan Party [RAK—Democratic Liberal Party].

When asked to comment about his duties as responsible official for news services at the Yerevan office of the Armenian General Benevolent Union [AGBU], Avetikyan replied: "Yes, I came here with a mission to gather news. Considering the fact for the last two or more years nearly 60 percent of the coverage in our papers abroad has concerned Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], a time came when the news transmitted by the official news agencies like ARMENPRES and by our organizations no longer satisfied us. We needed more authentic and exact news to satisfy our specific concerns. Therefore, my main duty at the AGBU's Yerevan office is to gather news and to transmit it daily via satellite to the editors of 14 newspapers in the diaspora belonging to the RAK as well as to AGBU's press center in Washington. The latter in turn prepares summaries from the transmitted news and sends them to international press agencies in Washington such as UPI, AFP, and others. Besides that, I have a consultative role in the office given the fact the the AGBU is on the verge of implementing some major projects in Armenia whose progress must be supervised."

Immediate Measures To Disarm Armenians Announced

LD2507125290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 25 Jul 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] President Mutalibov of Azerbaijan has announced that immediate measures will be taken on the territory of the republic to disarm Armenian fighters [boyevik] and to ensure the safety of the civilian population.

Attacks on Armenian Villages in NKAO Reported

NC2407145290 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Text] Yerevan, 23 Jul (ARMENPRES)—The Azerbaijani guerrillas have stepped up their operations in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] under cover of the mass disinformation campaign which has been occupying a large part of the central press and central television coverage lately.

On the evening of 15 July a large number of Azerbaijani guerrillas attacked the Armenian village of Karin Tak from the direction of Shusha. They blew up the mountain pass. Fire from automatic weapons rained on the village all night long, writes E. Bagiyants in the Russian language KOMMUNIST newspaper. The subunits of the USSR internal troops, which were removed from Karin Tak and deployed in Shusha, made no effort to prevent the attack.

On the evening of 16 July the village again came under intensive fire. Fortunately there were no casualties.

A large number of Azerbaijanis armed with combat automatic weapons attacked Kirov, that is, Berdadzor village from the direction of Lachin at 1500 on 16 July. Bagiyants recounts that the criminals then drove more than 200 sheep in the direction of Hunanav village in Lachinskiy rayon. The inhabitants of Kirov came to the assistance of the drovers and brought back the herd. No one was injured during the exchange of fire.

Official Visits Border Rayons, Security Viewed

NC2407195290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs has announced that the Armenian bandits are maintaining their uninterrupted provocations in Azerbaijan's rayons bordering the neighboring republic. Additional units of the internal affairs organs, internal troops, and military forces have been sent to the border region. Many of the installations have been placed under protection.

Mamed Asadov, Azerbaijan SSR minister of internal affairs, has visited the Kel'badzharskiy, Kubatlinskiy, Lachinskiy, and Zangelanskiy Rayons for a few days. He traveled to a number of residential areas and farming settlements and met with the shepherds and their families. He also replied to their questions and explained the measures that have been taken to provide security for the people. Meetings were also held with the rayon party and economic aktivs, including the representatives of the people.

The results of the visit were examined in Gendzha. Kirov, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs, arrived in Gendzha earlier. Kirov and the other leading officials of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs were briefed on the situation. It was noted that the establishment of security in the border region depend, above all else, on the serious measures that will be taken to disarm the militarized Armenian groups in Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Kirov and Asadov visited Khanlarskiy Rayon and examined matters related to the establishment of law and order in Chaykend. It will be recalled that helicopters without identification insignia frequently fly to that town. Measures have been established to obstruct lawless activities originating from Armenia.

Disgraced Leader May Attend Azerbaijan Congress

PM2407151590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Has Aliyev Returned?"]

[Text] Having arrived in Baku a few days ago, Geydar Aliyev landed on 22 July in his homeland, the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic].

The arrival of the former republic party organization leader in Azerbaijan was interpreted equivocally. The Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress resumes work 27 July in Baku. G. Aliyev was delegated to this congress by his fellow-countrymen but nevertheless did not attend the first part of the congress. In Baku they are suggesting that G. Aliyev will take part in the work of the republic party congress.

Aliyev Meeting in Nakhichevan Attracts Crowd

PM2407165190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Untitled INTERFAX report]

[Text] Geydar Aliyev met with the local populace in Lenin Square in Nakhichevan on the evening of 22 July. Around 30,000 people took part in the meeting. No details are known yet.

Party Officials Discuss Election Preparations

NC2407182290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Excerpts] What will be the (?place) of the sovereign, democratic, and economically independent state of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] in a renewed Soviet Federation? The reply to this question depends in various respects on the new parliament that is established. The appropriate cadres must be elected as deputies so that the parliament that is established may be an organ of genuine popular sovereignty, which will represent the true interests and demands of the people of Azerbaijan.

A lively, open, and interesting exchange of views took place during the seminar held by the secretaries of the district, city, and rayon party committees at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee on 19 July on

matters related to preparations for the forthcoming elections. President Ayaz Mutalibov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, chaired the meeting. [passage omitted]

Detailed replies were given to the many questions asked by the participants in the meeting. Gasan Gasanov, R. Guseynov, and V. Polyanichko also addressed the seminar. President Mutalibov summed up the meeting. Comrades Alekperov, Kafarova, Muradaliyev, Orudzhev, and Rizayev participated in the work of the gathering.

Azerbaijan's Mutalibov Views Moscow Meeting

NC2407200290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Text] It was reported earlier that President Gorbachev chaired a joint meeting of the USSR Federation Council and the USSR Presidential Council in the Kremlin on 20 July. Members of the Presidential Council and the Federation Council, members of the USSR Government who were invited to attend the convocation, and the competent representatives of a number of Union and autonomous republics participated in the debate on the matters that were included on the agenda of the meeting.

President Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, replied to the questions put to him by a correspondent upon his arrival at Baku Airport from Moscow.

Mutalibov was asked the following question: Comrade Mutalibov, you have returned from the joint meeting held by the USSR Federation Council and the USSR Presidential Council. What was discussed during the meeting? He replied as follows:

The meeting discussed matters related to the organizational measures required for economic reform, the adoption of a market economy system, and the drawing up of the Union treaty. Meanwhile, the account given by the president of Azerbaijan led to a sharp debate for more than 30 minutes. In this account, which was in the form of an ultimatum by the entire people of Azerbaijan, the republic's leadership demanded that the USSR president move to take resolute measures to immediately disarm the Armenians and provide security for the peaceful residents of our republic.

Later, Comrade Mutalibov asserted: The representatives of many of the Union republics supported our account. It was noted with great unease that the interethnic disputes and violation of laws in various parts of the country are (?resulting in deaths). Regrettably, the presidential system is not moving in a fully responsible manner on the disruption of the rights of the people and on matters related to the establishment of security for them. The urgency of the measures the USSR president should take to create law and order in the country and deepen the reconstruction course was noted in particular.

Concluding, Comrade Mutalibov said: We believe that the measures that will be put into effect during the forthcoming days will create a strong conviction on the part of the Soviet people that the USSR president's decisions will be fair and resolute.

Liberal Democratic Congress Held in Tbilisi

LD2407133790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Video report from the inaugural congress of the Liberal Democratic National Party in Tbilisi by Georgian correspondent Nana Gongadze]

[Text] Now reportage on yet another inaugural congress—this time, of the Liberal Democratic National Party [liberalno-demokraticheskaya natsionalnaya partiya]—filed by our Georgian correspondent Nana Gongadze. Incidentally, the Liberal Democrats are the only supporters of obtaining full independence for Georgia by legal means.

[Gongadze] The organization comprises only 150 people, though they have far more sympathizers. At their first congress, the Liberal Democrats adopted new rules and a program and considered the issue of the forthcoming elections. [video shows congress]

[M. Naneishvili, chairman of the board of the party] Nationalists believe that the world or mankind is made up of nations and that it is those nations that create culture and history. The true nationalist must be liberal-democratic. This is the line Ilya Chavchavadze took and we are now continuing this line, though of course we also number the great Western and European thinkers among our mentors. We believe that if the elections go well, Georgia will take a decisive step towards restoring its independence. [video shows interview with Naneishvili]

Hijacker Faces Charges in Sukhumi

LD2307153990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 23 Jul 90

[Video report from Sukhumi by correspondent N. Gongadze]

[Text] We hope that the epidemic of hijacking our airplanes by schoolchildren is ending. Incidentally, we are the only country where minors can hijack a plane or land in a place on the capital's central square. Turkey has just handed over one of the first hijackers.

[N. Gongadze] The Sukhumi transport procuracy has instituted criminal proceedings as a result of the air incident. Investigations are under way. So far, it has been established that 23-year-old garment factory docker Vitaliy Latyy, an inhabitant of the town of Odessa, had a normal tin can and an iron ring in his bag instead of an

exlosive device. [video shows reporter entering secure area and then room in which the prisoner is being interviewed]

[Latyy] I took a risk: either to go to prison—which was one hundred percent certain—or get to Turkey in order to start a new life.

[Gongadze] And what did you intend to do there?

[Latyy] Work.

[Gongadze] Do you have a trade?

[Latyy] Yes.

[Gongadze] What?

[Latyy] Automobile metal worker—and also a marine motor mechanic. [video shows Latyy facing the camera]

[S.D. Bganba, Sukhumi transport procuator] Latyy is being charged on two counts. The first charge warrants three years imprisonment, the second from five to 15 years. He has committed a serious crime, but his is an orphan, he made a frank confession of his crime, and we hope that the court will take into account his repentance. [video shows Bganba facing the camera]

Central Asia

Kazakhstan's Nazarbayev Tours United States

LD2207003690 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Text] Nursultan Abishevich Nazarbayev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, USSR Council of the Federation member, president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], and first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, is in the U.S. capital, Washington. He arrived in the United States at the invitation of Dixon, president of the U.S. trading consortium (?ATK). This concern, along with a number of other major American and British firms and companies, is showing considerable interest in developing gas and oil fields in western Kazakhstan, and also in expanding mutually advantageous economic cooperation with the Kazakh SSR, and with Soviet organizations in general. In Washington Comrade Nazarbayev was received at the White House by Brent Scowcroft, national security affairs assistant to the United States President, and on Capitol Hill by Robert Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the Senate of the U.S. Congress. The eminent guest from Kazakhstan described the processes of perestroyka, glasnost, and democratization which are under way in the USSR, and of its transformation into a genuine union state based on self-determination and unity of peoples. The communists and people of Kazakhstan, Comrade Nazarbayev stressed, are firm supporters of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the policy of perestroyka aimed at the country's revolutionary turn toward humanism, democracy, and social justice. They advocate strengthening the political and economic sovereignty of the republic within the framework of the Union federation. The president of Kazakhstan also noted that under the new conditions broad prospects are opening up in the Kazakh SSR for the independent development of ties with foreign countries, including business ties, which meet the fundamental interests of the Kazakh people. On Thursday [19 July] Comrade Nazarbayev also had meetings with Nicholas Brady, U.S. secretary of the treasury, and Les Aspin, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives. Under discussion were matters of interest to both sides relating to expanding cooperation between the two countries in the economic field, and also joint steps in the sphere of limiting the arms race and disarmament. Ahead lies a big journey around the United States, in the course of which the Kazakh SSR president and the persons accompanying him will visit San Francisco, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Houston.

New Trade Union Newspaper Published in Alma-Ata

LD2507090890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] A new newspaper has started coming out in the capital of Kazakhstan. The press organ of the Alma-Ata Oblast trade union council, ALATAU, is published in Russian and Kazakh.

Further on Interethnic Tension in Osh Oblast

Official on Judicial Inquiry

LD2407054690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 2300 GMT on 23 July carries a 2.5-minute report from Frunze by Aleksandr Mirtov on the situation in the Osh Oblast. He says a large group of investigators from the USSR Procuracy, KGB, and Ministry of Internal Affairs is working there. Vladimir Ivanovich Kravtsev, deputy USSR procurator general, comments on the situation there. Kravtsev emphasizes that in his work it is very important to observe the law. He says that for the events of 4-8 July, which took place in both the town of Osh and the Uzgen rayon adjoining it, approximately 10,000 criminal acts have been recorded. Seventy-eight people have already been arrested. In a number of cases a preliminary investigation is about to be completed. Cases concerning the murder of a people's judge of the Kara-Su rayon and her sister will be forwarded to the court in the very near future. Again in the Kara-su rayon, a case concerning the murder of Usmanov, militia employee, will be forwarded to the court. Kravtsev says that in the USSR only the court has the right to declare somebody a criminal and to define his or her punishment.

Official Cited on Investigation

PM2407092790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Report by A. Poklad from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Concern continues about events in Osh, where clashes between representatives of the Uzbek and Kirghiz communities continue. Unfortunately, there has been no relaxation in the tension. Street rallies are continuing. Some 180 people have been arrested for curfew violations. Firearms are being confiscated from the population. People are alarmed about rumors of possible new mass unrest. Here is an eyewitness report from our special correspondent.

[Poklad] [video shows damaged buildings, refugee camp] The situation in Osh Oblast today was relatively quiet. But the conflicts are by no means over. The current center of the tension is Uzgen. The city is virtually blockaded by women from outlying settlements picketing the roads. Our film crew visited an Uzbek refugee camp in Uzgen and a Kirghiz refugee camp in Mirzaaki. They are home to a concentration of hundreds of people left homeless and without means of existence. In conversation with us people stressed that Kirghiz and Uzbek people should not be divided. Many people believe that the conflict emerged because of the unbalanced policy pursued by the former oblast leadership. People also complain about certain press organs which have published unverified and often exaggerated casualty figures and picked up rumors about the alleged inaction of law enforcement organs. Yet just a few ill-advised words could trigger off a new outburst of violence.

[Poklad] A common rumor at the moment is that guilty people aren't being punished and that investigations are being badly conducted. What can you say about that?

[V.Ye. Kostarev, investigator of particularly important cases with the USSR Prosecutor's Office] A USSR Prosecutor's Office investigations group is at work in the region. It comprises Prosecutor's Office investigators, Ministry of Internal Affairs operatives, and investigators with KGB organs' operational apparatus. There are currently around 80 investigators working in the group along with over 100 operatives. This is clearly inadequate. We have currently recorded around 5,000 reports of crimes. We have arrested 41 people for serious crimes. We're primarily focusing on the fight against serious crime—rape and murder. They have all been arrested and charged. Investigations are under way.

[Poklad] It's hard to make any forecasts at the moment, but from people's attitudes we've seen that there is a growing understanding here of the need for reconciliation.

59 Percent Return to Work

LD2407140690 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] Frunze July 24 KIRTAG-TASS—The situation in Osh region did not change greatly on Monday. According to data from the regional statistical board, 59 percent of the employed resumed work at industrial enterprises, 89 percent in construction, 78.7 percent in transport organisations, 95.6 in trade, 91.9 in public catering, 78.8 in the general service sector and 93.2 percent in the communications sector.

Members of the Kirghiz parliament's standing commissions met and talked to residents of Osh and Jalalabad, Sovetskiy, Kara Su and other districts, discussing measures aimed at normalising the situation, at restoring order as soon as possible and at firmly putting a stop to hooliganism.

Individual negative manifestations were noted in Osh.

Tear Gas Used in Clashes

LD2407195290 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Text] In view of persisting tensions in Kirghizia's Osh region, local police have been compelled to resort to harsh measures to control bloody clashes between the Uzbeks and the Kirghiz. According to the Interior Ministry spokesman Colonel (?Kotlivov), they have used tear gas more than 10 times to prevent outbursts of violence.

Disturbances have shifted from the squares and markets of Osh into public transport, where extremists have been seen provoking fist and knife fights.

Situation 'Again Exacerbated'

LD2407203790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By Osh Oblast correspondent Aleksandr Mirtov]

[Text] Over the past 24 hours, 45 crimes and incidents have been registered in the oblast, and on the whole the situation still remains tense. An order from the commandant of Osh Oblast has come into force on urgent measures to stabilize the social and political situation. Mass manifestations of hooliganism, fights, and unsanctioned rallies have not only again exacerbated the situation and aggravated the hostility between the Uzbeks and the Kirghiz, but they have also practically paralyzed the operation of many industrial enterprises, transport, and trade, which is evoking in people a natural state of uncertainty and animosity.

Last Sunday, when the leaders of the republic, the oblast, and the town met with representatives of the Russian-speaking population of Osh, this was also spoken about. You see, in spite of the complexity of the situation, the heads of many enterprises were first and foremost to blame for not operating. And you see, that means losses

of many millions. It means detriments incurred primarily by oneself. The working class of Osh is international in its composition: The events that have occurred here have shown that there were very few of its representatives who gave way to provocation, or who were intoxicated with vengeance and hostility. People want to live calmly and work. It turned out to be easy to cause a quarrel between two peoples that had lived together for centuries and that will have to live alongside each other in the future, too. The path to reconciliation will undoubtedly be a long and difficult one. Neither the army nor anyone else can resolve these problems. Only the Uzbek and Kirghiz peoples can settle all the conflicts. And to do that they have to meet one another half way, with the mutual desire to understand and forgive each other.

At the numerous meetings in towns and villages to which the leaders of the Republic and the oblast are coming in these days, people are demanding that the situation should be brought back to normal as soon as possible. But who can do that, if not the Uzbeks and Kirghiz themselves in their mahallas, villages, and towns? An example like this has already been set. At the recent meeting of representatives of two towns—Kirghiz Dzhalal-Abad and Uzbek Sovietabad—a treaty on friendship and hope is the fact that all those who spoke at that meeting came to the following opinion: Let two peoples become one; let there be reconciliation.

Update on Osh Situation

LD2507061790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] The situation in Osh Oblast in Kirghizia continues to be difficult, although a tendency toward normalization has taken shape. Practical implementation of the order of the oblast commandant concerning urgent measures to stabilize the sociopolitical situation has begun. As a result, hooliganism, fights, and arson have been reduced. Staff of law enforcement bodies are doing much work among the population about strict fulfillment of the requirements of the state of emergency. In the oblast center, Osh, the labor rhythm at industrial enterprises and in transport is being restored, shops are operating, and cafes are open.

Internal Troops Sent to Uzgen

LD2507093190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 25 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A report from Osh Oblast. In the past 24 hours there has been no great change in the operational situation. At the same time, not all working people have yet gone in to work in the oblast center. Seven leaders have been fined for failing to ensure the normal functioning of individual commercial and public catering enterprises. Things remain troubled in Uzgenskiy Rayon. A sub-unit of internal troops has been dispatched to the town of Uzgen to keep public order.

Tajik Trade Union Paper Begins Publication

LD2007162890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Jul 90

[Text] MEKHNAT is the name given by the Tajik republican trade union organization to its newspaper. Its first issue was published today. It carries an article by (Umarov), doctor of economics, on problems of the republic's transfer to market relations. Tajik trade unions have found their voice. The newspaper is published both in Tajik and in Russian.

Uzbek Leader Views Party's Current Role

PM2407161590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[Interview with I.A. Karimov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, by A. Shinkin: "Regaining People's Confidence"]

[Text] Uzbekistan is going through a difficult time at the moment. Too many problems have accumulated in the republic. There have been distortions in economic policy and there have been abuses by some leaders, due to the bureaucratic command system. The consequence of this, it has to be said, is the indigent condition of the majority of the population and a surge of ethnic tension.... Therefore the conversation with I.A. Karimov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, turned on the republican party organization's paramount concerns in present conditions.

[Shinkin] We met at the 28th party congress, Islam Abduganiyevich. What aspect of the congress work would you like to mention? Did you take anything new away with you from Moscow?

[Karimov] The first thing I want to say is that the preparations for the congress were pretty good. Like me, I am sure you would never imagine that fundamental decisions could be elaborated at a congress. Obviously, it takes a whole series of meetings and conferences and a careful study of public opinion and of the state of affairs in the Union republics, in primary party organizations, and above all in those regions where the situation is particularly alarming at the moment. This did not happen. Hence the emotional outbursts at the congress on particular questions—whenever it was not the crux of the problem that was being addressed, but the speaker's often highly subjective concept of it.

Even the work of the section on party renewal—and, in my view, it was one of the most important—was not properly organized. All those who wanted to spoke, everyone was given the chance to let off steam, so to

speak. Let people talk a little more and very likely they will talk too much.... And what then?

Nevertheless, the 13 days of congress work were not wasted. Each new stage of discussion brought viewpoints closer together and helped elaborate integrated theses which many currents will hold in common and will be springboards for party organizations' future work.

I am convinced that the party that shows the people a convincing way out of the social and interethnic crisis will be a strong party and will be authoritative in the people's eyes. V. Shved, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) Central Committee, was right when he said that the party's goals and its program must be attractive to the people. Only then will they believe that this party can indeed be renewed and can lead. Otherwise, if we fail to convince people by our actions, we will arrive at the final disintegration of the party, and, consequently, of the country as well. The CPSU is perhaps the only thing that binds our multinational state together today.

[Shinkin] What do you think is the actual cause of the problems the party is facing today?

[Karimov] There is no clear stance, purposeful work, or unified ideology. Although Comrade Medvedev spent a very long time at the congress endeavoring to demonstrate the opposite. But his entire speech was more like a lecture than an accountability report, in which he declared his concept of the goals and tasks of CPSU ideology. But here are some simple questions. Why is the concept not being put into practice? Why do people say one thing and then something quite different happens in practice? How do you explain the helplessness of party commitees—from rayon committee [raykom] to Central Committee?... These and many other questions remained unanswered. Are people going to respect a party that allows itself to be in many respects groundlessly vilified?

[Shinkin] Do these words not contain an element of nostalgia for the past, when the party ran everything by diktat?

[Karimov] Let us face the facts: Everything is falling apart rapidly in the country. We have destroyed one system, but we have not created another to replace it. When people are wondering what the problem is, why do they start pointing the finger at us party workers, saying that we are hankering after, nostalgic for a firm hand. We have had a bellyful of the firm hand bugbear. In my view, discipline and order are essential elements of any democracy. It simply cannot be sustained without it. Therefore, I believe that our party will be acknowledged as the leading party when it ensures the consolidation of all healthy forces for the sake of socialist ideals and consistently and firmly conducts its own policy.

[Shinkin] There is a vast amount of talk about consolidation at the moment. But it is only talk. What do you think the word means?

[Karimov] I agree that it is time to switch from slogans to action. Only action can unite people; vague prospects are futile. But first we must have a clear idea of what we are going to do and in what timeframe.

For instance, in Uzbekistan we have devised a specific program. And I will say without false modesty that it has the people's backing. What have we done recently? We have given people land. In the conditions of Uzbekistan, where there are seven to eight people on average per family, and even more in some places, and where neither the housing nor the food question has been tackled for decades, it was indispensable. We adopted the decision, and today we can guarantee every family 0.25 hectares. Some 1.6 million families have now received around 165,000 hectares of land. This has nearly doubled the area of personal subsidiary plots. And Soviet power did not reel as a result.... In fact, we can confidently say that this year vegetables in the republic's markets are cheaper than ever. For example, you pay 40 kopeks for a kilogram of tomatoes.

Take another question. In schools attended by 4.5 million children free food has been introduced from the first through the third grades. We include products supplied by kolkhozes and sovkhozes to schools and to hospitals and children's institutions in purchase plans. Everyone is happy. In short, on the basis of people's interests, we have reviewed many pressing problems in favor of people and their rights.

The spiritual sphere is no exception. We have a festival called Navruz. It was celebrated in Central Asia, and particularly in the East, long before the Muslim faith was introduced. Then five years ago they went and banned it. We lifted the ban. And do you know what a fine event it was this year. Literally everyone participated—Uzbeks, Tajiks, Russians, Ukrainians, and people of other nationalities. It was a day when the representatives of every people expressed their friendship for one another. Which was so important following the well-known events and manifestations of interethnic strife. In fact, it was not the people who participated in them, but a certain number of misguided, crazed individuals. I would point out that all the ethnically motivated clashes followed the same scenario. But we did not find the people who were behind them. Until there is a political assessment of these events, I do not think the problem will be solved. Force just makes the disease more deep-seated. Political methods are needed.

And another vital element. Much has been said, at the congress among other places, about criticism of the party. But how do our opponents acquire their authority? By exploiting our mistakes, in cases where we set ourselves against the people by using methods that involve prohibition and coercive tactics in our work. Now, as you can imagine, many of our opponents are alarmed by the fact that all the questions which they pushed in order to establish themselves as informal leaders are in fact being solved and the people are ceasing to listen to them. So, to sum up, only by political methods can the CPSU gain authority among the people. There is no other way. People need to be fed, shod, and clothed now. The era of naked slogans is past.

[Shinkin] It has been reported in the press that private ownership is being boldly introduced in the republic....

[Karimov] I would say this: We are not dragging our feet in the sphere of developing and strengthening forms of ownership. In local industry three private enterprises have been set up to make ethnic musical instruments and ethnic goods. We are intending to transfer all small consumer and trade outlets in the countryside to private hands. In other words, essentially legalize what has been going on for a long time. We are also working on the creation of an association of modern farmers and owners of personal subsidiary plots. After all, they provide 40 percent of foodstuffs in the republic.

[Shinkin] Have the new conditions affected the work style of republican party committees and primary party organziations?

[Karimov] The fact that party organizations have started to reestablish their authority, which had been undermined, certainly has. The gap between people and party organizations is narrowing. But there is a chronic, I would say genetic disease which besets party workers: They are still living by the old stereotypes. City committees [gorkoms] and raykoms do not want to surrender the power they have held for so many years. How can it be: Yesterday all matters were resolved at the raykom, now the local soviet is in charge. So some think there is no longer anything for them to do.... I believe it will take time to recover from the disease.

[Shinkin] There was anxiety at the congress about attempts to separate the party into ethnic islands, so to speak. What model of relations within the party would be more to your liking?

[Karimov] Personally, I am in favor of the CPSU's representing a union of Union republican communist parties. Why? I will explain. The Political Report said that each republic will be a sovereign state, which will tackle all the questions on its own territory, aside from those it voluntarily delegates to the center. That being the case, the present status of Union reopublic communist parties is entirely incompatible with this. They are essentially territorial divisions of the CPSU. Incidentally, there is no big difference between, say, the republican Communist Party Central Committee and the oblast committee [obkom]. They have approximately the same status. And some people in the CPSU Central Committee want that situation to continue. It is easy to control and easy to command....

But then one wonders: How, in conditions of sovereignty and a multiparty system, are we going to tackle questions, pursue a flexible line, and express the opinions and interests of the local population and specific local conditions, and how are we going to acquire authority among people?... Indeed, our opposition will have a better chance of victory than we communists, who are supposed to be with the people and for the people, but have nothing to offer them, since we do not have sufficient rights and freedom of action.

It is my profound belief that the republican communist parties must now adhere to unified Statutes and a common CPSU Program and follow the Central Committee line. However, tactical matters, cadre and financial matters and so on—all this must be dealt with locally. Otherwise we will not have a leg to stand on in the multiparty system that beckons us tomorrow.

[Shinkin] In your opinion, Islam Abduganiyevich, what has more influence—the post of republican Communist Party Central Committee first secretary or President of Uzbekistan? And what do you think about combining the posts?

[Karimov] Let us consider the objective situation. Now that the president lacks a viable system of organizations to carry out his decrees, he is essentially a person who makes decisions but cannot guarantee their implementation. That is a nice point.

At the same time, there is a functioning structure. Whatever you say, the party system is well organized from top to bottom. And the president is able to achieve more by using this second, party power to implement and organize the monitoring of his decisions.

During the discussion at the congress about the impossibility of combining the posts there was more emotion than thorough study of the issue. Now that real power is passing from party to soviet organs, I deeply believe that this combination should remain. Otherwise the process could turn into confrontation between party and soviet organs. Everyone will be pulling in his own direction. We must not forget this.

[Shinkin] At the last Uzbek Communist Party Congress there was much criticism of the media. Does this not reflect your attitude toward the press?

[Karimov] My view is clear: You have to have a dialogue with the press. You have to work with the press and at least try to persuade journalists that you are right. But sometimes we get a situation where an article appears which we do not like for a number of reasons. And we immediately see its authors as enemies. I have always believed that criticism should be regarded as a good, fair friend, who tells you the truth to your face....

On the other hand, there are journalists who serve certain individuals rather than the truth, who express the interests of groups and cliques. I would have thought that the leaders of the press themselves should draw conclusions about their employees.

My advice to the press is to adopt a very subtle, balanced approach to the coverage of ethnic relations. The people of Uzbekistan, for example, are clearly aware of the lack of objectivity, of the bias. The uninitiated may get the impression that half the people in the republic are involved in swindles, bribery, or theft. In fact, the majority are very poor. Then you have to respect the people you are writing about. That, in my view, is the main condition of mutual understanding. By not respecting the people he is writing about, a journalist, whether he intends it or not, creates images that are far from the truth.